THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXVII, No. 1 JULY, 1957

CONTENTS

Our Lady in Canon Law ..... *Thomas Owen Martin* 1

Criticism and Censorship ..... *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 9

The Buffalo Plan for the Religious Education of Pre-School Children ..... *Daniel F. O'Leary, O.M.I.* 18

Father James Gillis, C.S.P. ..... *John C. Selner, S.S.* 31

Toynbee and the Somervell Abridgments ..... *Robert Paul Mohan, S.S.* 39

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., and Walter J. Schmitz, S.S.

The Absolution of a Recidivist 49

The Contraceptive Pill 50

Some Problems on the Eucharistic Fast 51

Holy Communion During Holy Week 54

Evening Masses 55

Round Altar 55

Gloves at Time of Holy Communion 56

Leonine Prayers 56

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1957 by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Gospel Bows 57
Assistant Priest at Jubilee Mass 57
Rogation Day Litany 57
Two Priests Distributing Holy Communion 58
Communion to a Well Person Attending the Sick 58

ANALECTA

Recent Roman Documents. *Romaeus W. O'Brien, O.Carm.* 59

BOOK REVIEWS

Guidance for Religious, *by Gerald Kelly, S.J.* 66
Priest of the Plague: Henry Morse, S.J., *by Philip Caraman* 68
The Reluctant Abbess, *by Margaret Trouncer* 70
The Bible and the Liturgy, *by Jean Danielou, S.J.* 71
Martyrs in China, *by Jean Monsterleet, S.J.* 72

Now available in reprint form—

Catholics in Colonial America

by

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

Professor of Church History
The Catholic University of America

This article originally appeared in 5 installments, in the January through May 1957 issues of *The American Ecclesiastical Review.*

80 Pages and Cover Price: $1.00 Postpaid

(discount on 10 or more copies)

Address:

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
The Catholic University of America
WASHINGTON 17, D. C.

OUR LADY IN CANON LAW

The basic statement in the Code regarding devotion to Our Lady tells us that it is good and useful to invoke suppliantly the Servants of God who reign with Christ and to venerate their relics and images; but especially all the faithful are to honor the Blessed Virgin Mary with filial devotion.[1]

The type of cult which is due her is specified as *hyperdulia;* for, as the Code says: to the Most Blessed Trinity, to each of the Persons thereof, to Christ the Lord, likewise under the sacramental species, is due the cult of *latria;* to the Blessed Virgin Mary the cult of *hyperdulia;* to the others who reign in heaven with Christ the cult of *dulia.*[2]

This cult of the Blessed Virgin Mary is expressed also in the various Feast Days which the Church has established in her honor. Thus, the present Pontiff has established the Feast of the Queenship of Mary to be celebrated throughout the world on May 31.[3] In addition, the Code already mentions the Feasts of her Immaculate Conception and of her Assumption as feast-days of precept in the universal Church.[4]

Lest, however, anything occur to mar the beauty of its cult, the Church prohibits *ipso iure* images, no matter how printed, of Our Lord Jesus Christ, of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of the Angels and of the Saints or of other servants of God which are foreign to the sense and decrees of the Church.[5] For this reason the Holy Office has condemned the representation of the Blessed Virgin

[1] Can. 1276.

[2] Can. 1255, § 1.

[3] Pius XII, *litt. encyc.,* Oct. 11, 1954, *AAS* 46 (1954), 625. For his allocution on the occasion of the crowning of the ancient picture of Our Lady, *Salus Populi Romani,* from St. Mary Major's, on Nov. 1, 1954, in St. Peter's, see *AAS* 46 (1954), 662. For the Indulgenced prayer, see S. Poen., March 15, 1955, *AAS* 47 (1955), 421. For the office and Mass for the feast, see S. C. Rit., May 31, 1955, *AAS* 47 (1955), 470.

[4] Can. 1247, § 1.

[5] Can. 1399, 12°.

clothed in priestly vestments.[6] As a general rule, indeed, the Code establishes that it is not allowed for anyone to place in churches or in other sacred places any unusual image, unless that image is approved by the Ordinary of the place. Furthermore, the Ordinary is warned not to approve sacred images which are not in accord with the approved usage of the Church to be exposed publicly for the veneration of the faithful.[7]

How much the Church approves and encourages this cult of Our Lady is clearly indicated by the approval of the statutes for the World Federation of the Sodalities of Our Lady,[8] and the allocution addressed by our Holy Father to the delegates to the first meeting of that World Federation in Rome, Sept. 8, 1954.[9]

Probably the most widespread single devotion to Our Lady is that of her rosary. This the Code strongly recommends for the clergy and for the members of religious communities. For the clergy, it states that the Ordinaries of places are to take care that their clergy daily honor the Virgin Mother of God with the rosary of Mary.[10] For the members of religious communities it provides that all such persons are likewise bound by the common obligations of the clergy, mentioned in Canons 124-42, unless from the context or from the nature of the matter the contrary is clear.[11]

One of the problems which has arisen in connection with the recitation of the rosary has been that of the addition of words in the recitation thereof. This has come about because of the provision that if a particular prayer is assigned for the gaining of an indulgence, the indulgence ceases completely if there is any addition, detraction, or interpolation in the prayer assigned.[12] In some places the custom exists of adding certain words to the Hail Mary in the recitation of the rosary for the purpose of recalling to mind the mystery. When asked whether such a custom might be kept without prejudice to the indulgences attached to the rosary the Sacred Penitentiary replied, on July 27, 1920, in the negative.

[6] Holy Office, Apr. 8, 1916, *AAS* 8 (1916), 146.
[7] Can. 1279, §§ 1-2.
[8] Pius XII, Letter to Fr. Louis Paulussen, S.J., Pres. of the International Secretariate of the Sodality of Our Lady, July 2, 1953, *AAS* 45 (1953), 494.
[9] Pius XII, *Alloc.*, Sept. 8, 1954, *AAS* 46 (1954), 529.
[10] Can. 125, 2°.
[11] Can. 592.
[12] Can. 934, § 2.

After this reply became known, however, certain Bishops in Germany and Switzerland reported that the custom of adding such words had become so fixed and was of such long standing in their dioceses that it could not be removed without causing scandal and disturbance to the faithful. They also reported that Pope Pius IX had graciously permitted, in 1859, that in places where the custom already existed, the faithful reciting the rosary in that manner might gain the indulgences. In the light of this report the Sacred Penitentiary declared that Canon 934, § 2 contains a general law which, according to Canon 4, does not revoke the indult of Pius IX. It also announced that the Holy Father was petitioned to extend the aforesaid indult in favor of all persons who, anywhere, are accustomed to recite the rosary in the manner indicated. The declarations were approved and confirmed by His Holiness.[13]

A similar problem was presented by the Ordinary of the Ruthenians of Stanislaov. He asked whether the faithful of the Ruthenian rite gain the indulgences annexed to the recitation of the rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary, even though according to their rite the angelic salutation is different from that of the Latin rite and contains at the end a brief mention of the corresponding mystery. The Sacred Penitentiary, after mature consideration, replied in the negative; but reported that in view of what the Most Reverend Ordinary stated in his letter, by authority of the Holy Father, at whose direction the question was referred to that Sacred Tribunal, the Sacred Penitentiary graciously permitted that all the faithful of the Ruthenian rite who were accustomed to recite the angelic salutation in the manner indicated when they said the rosary might gain all the indulgences of the rosary.[14]

That which had already been granted to the faithful of the Ruthenian rite by the Decree of April 29, 1930, the Sacred Penitentiary, by order and upon the authority of His Holiness, Pius XI, graciously extended also to the faithful of the Byzantine-Slavic rite, so that all and each of them who recited the rosary of the Blessed Virgin in the way which was peculiar to their rite might gain all the indulgences annexed to it.[15]

[13] S. Poen., Declaration and Indult, Jan. 22, 1922, *AAS* 13 (1922), 163.
[14] S. Poen., Reply, Apr. 29, 1930, *AAS* 22 (1930), 292.
[15] S. Poen., Decree, Jan. 31, 1931, *AAS* 23 (1931), 88.

In this same vein is the Notification by the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, given April 22, 1944. It says:

On the third of June, 1888, the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences and Relics issued the following rescript.—The Sacred Congregation of Indulgences and Sacred Relics, using faculties specially granted to it by His Holiness Leo XIII, graciously declares, and in as far as it may be necessary grants an indult, that the angelic salutation, as it has hitherto been customarily recited among the Ruthenians and other faithful of the Oriental rite, whenever it is prescribed as a necessary condition for gaining indulgences, is of equal value for this effect as is the angelic salutation which is recited by the faithful of the Latin Church, all things to the contrary, etc.—Since, however, certain discussions have arisen as to the meaning of this rescript, the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church proposed the following questions for solution to the Sacred Penitentiary: (1) Whether this rescript is still in effect. (2) Whether the rescript is good only for the faithful of the Oriental rites, or also for the faithful of the Latin rite, who recite the angelic salutation according to the text which is in use in the Oriental rites. (3) Whether the indulgences attached to the recitation of the rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary can be gained by all who recite the angelic salutation according to the text which is in use in the Oriental rites. The Sacred Penitentiary, on March 21, 1944, decided to reply to the proposed questions as follows: (1) In the affirmative. (2) In the negative to the first part; in the affirmative to the second. (3) In the affirmative; but let no change be made in the public recitation."[16]

In an audience given to the Cardinal Penitentiary on Oct. 11, 1954, the present Holy Father granted petitions which certain bishops had made in the interests of a more holy family life.[17] The Church had already conceded, for the family recitation of the rosary, a partial indulgence of ten years to be gained once on any day and a plenary indulgence which could be gained twice a month.[18] In virtue of this new decision, however, the faithful who recite a third part of the rosary in the family for a week may gain a plenary indulgence every Saturday and on two other days of the week, as well as on all the feasts of the Blessed Mother which are

[16] S. C. Eccl. Or., Notification, Apr. 22, 1944, *AAS* 36 (1944), 245.
[17] Cf. Encyc., *Fulgens Corona.*
[18] *Enchiridion Indulgentiarum,* ed. 1952, n. 395 b.

on the calendar of the Universal Church.[19] These indulgences, of course, are granted only under the usual conditions.[20]

The Sacred Penitentiary was also called upon to answer two questions submitted by the Procurator General of the Order of Friars Preachers. These questions had to do with the practice of reciting the rosary over the radio. The tribunal was asked first whether the faithful can gain the indulgences attached to the rosary if they recite it with a person who is not present with them, but whom they hear speaking over the radio. The second question presupposed a favorable response to the first. It asked if these indulgences could be gained if the voice on the radio came from a recording, rather than directly from a human being speaking into the microphone at that very moment. The tribunal answered the first question affirmatively and gave a negative response to the second.[21]

Pope Pius XI granted a plenary indulgence, under the usual conditions, to any of the faithful who say the rosary before the Blessed Sacrament, either exposed for public veneration or reserved in the tabernacle.[22] And a further indulgence of fifty days, which can be gained once each day, has been granted to those who kiss the rosary they carry and recite the first part of the Hail Mary.[23]

[19] Immaculate Conception, Purification, Apparition of Our Lady at Lourdes, Annunciation, Seven Dolors (Friday after Passion Sunday), Visitation, Our Lady of Mt. Carmel, Our Lady of the Snows, Assumption, Immaculate Heart of Mary, Nativity of Our Lady, Holy Name of Mary, Seven Dolors (Sept. 15), Our Lady of Ransom, Holy Rosary, Maternity, Presentation. To these has been added the Feast of the Queenship of Mary (May 31), Encyc., *Ad Coeli Reginam,* Oct. 11, 1954, *AAS* 46 (1954), 625.

[20] S. Poen., Oct. 11, 1954, *AAS* 46 (1954), 552.

[21] S. Poen. (Private), May 9, 1952, reported by Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest,* III, p. 390.

[22] Pius XI, Ap. Lett., Sept. 4, 1927, *AAS* 20 (1927), 376. Bouscaren, *op. cit.,* I, 450 notes that "A doubt concerning the interpretation of the expression 'as usual' (*juxta morem*) was presented to the S. Poen., which, however, declined to solve it, and replied that since the question involved an interpretation of c. 931, it should be referred to the Code Commission. The annotations of Vermeersch in *Periodica,* 16-125 and 17-74 are upon this question. He holds that for the gaining of this indulgence it is sufficient to receive Communion on the day before, or within the octave after the day to which the indulgence is attached; and that the Communion need not be repeated in order to gain the indulgence several times (cf. c. 933); also that no prayers need be said for the intention of the Holy Father."

[23] S. Poen., March 30, 1953, *AAS* 45 (1953), 311.

Another devotion to Our Lady which is of long standing is the recitation of her Little Office. In recent years, however, there has been a tendency to substitute for that Little Office the small Breviary in the Vernacular, as a result of the constantly growing liturgical movement. The Sacred Congregation for Religious is favorable in principle to all proposals which will insure a deeper and richer participation of religious in the sacred liturgy, since such participation brings them into more living contact with the Church. Nevertheless, it feels that all innovations must be worked out in a spirit of good balance and discretion. Again, nothing is comparable to the advantages of peace in a community. The Sacred Congregation does not grant any general permission for substituting the Divine Office in the vernacular for the Little Office. Each individual institute must ask for it and submit its own particular reasons for so doing. Proponents of the change oftentimes forget that it is hardly possible that an entire community will react favorably to the innovation, and it is the responsibility of the Sacred Congregation of Religious to forestall discontent and opposition as far as possible.

Consequently, the permission for the Divine Office in the vernacular instead of the Little Office will be granted on request, with due regard to the following conditions: (1) that the request be supported by the morally unanimous agreement of the general chapter—what causes trouble is not from God; (2) that the request be not in opposition with either the constitutions or the tradition of the community involved—sometimes the recitation of the Little Office is in conformity with a vow or promise made by the founder or foundress; (3) that the apostolate of the sisters allow them time for the recitation of the Divine Office without unduly overloading their day.[24]

Still, the indulgences for the recitation of the Little Office continue and are extended in a new and enlarged edition thereof. The Superioress General of the Congregation of Sisters of the Holy Cross, whose motherhouse is in Menzingen in the Diocese of Basle petitioned that the indulgences already granted for the recita-

[24] Fr. Aracadio Larraona, Sec. of the S.C.Rel., Address to Mothers General, Sept. 1952, reported by Bouscaren, *Supplement through 1955,* under Canon 502. Cf. also summary of the practice of the S.C.Rel. by Gutierrez, reported by Bouscaren, *Supplement,* under Canon. 489.

tion of the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin[25] might be extended to the recitation of the same Little Office in the new and enlarged form edited by Fr. Augustine Bea, S.J., not only in favor of the Sisters of the aforesaid Congregation, but also of other religious Institutes who might now use or might in future use this new edition of the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin. The Sacred Penitentiary granted this request.[26]

The close connection between devotion to Our Lady and the sanctification of the clergy is seen in the petition of the Superior General of the Society of the Divine Saviour and the reply thereto. The Superior General stated that the Society had begun to promote the pious exercise of praying for the sanctification of the clergy, the practice of offering to God on a certain day of each month a Mass and Communion and all the prayers and good works of that day, for the priests and levites of the Catholic Church. He then asked, in favor of the faithful who performed the said pious exercise either privately or in common in any church or oratory, for the following indulgences, to be gained under the usual conditions: (1) a plenary indulgence on the first Thursday or the first Saturday of each month, on Holy Thursday, on the Feast of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Queen of Apostles, and on the Feasts of the Holy Apostles; (2) a partial indulgence of seven years on the other days of the year on which they should have performed the same pious exercise. He also asked a partial indulgence of 300 days to be gained by the faithful who, devoutly and at least with a contrite heart, recited the invocation, "Jesus, Saviour of the world, sanctify your priests and levites." The Sacred Penitentiary granted his petition.[27]

The connection between devotion to Our Lady and the work for priestly vocations is to be seen in the Statutes of the Pontifical Work of Priestly Vocations. This work is consecrated to Our Lord Jesus Christ the Supreme and Eternal Priest; it is *entrusted to the maternal care of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Queen of Apostles* and to the guardianship of St. Joseph, the Patron of the Church Universal. It pays particular honor to the saintly Princes

[25] *Enchiridion Indulgentiarum,* ed. 1952, n. 318.

[26] S. Poen. (Private) March 11, 1955, reported by Bouscaren, *Supplement,* under Canon 925.

[27] S. Poen., Apr. 12, 1937, *AAS* 29 (1937), 285.

of the Apostles, Saints Peter and Paul. While the principal Feast Day of the Pontifical Work for Priestly Vocations is Holy Thursday, the day on which we commemorate the establishment of the priesthood, there is, among the special Feasts, the Solemnity of Our Lady the Queen of Apostles, on the Saturday within the Octave of the Ascension. Furthermore, a plenary indulgence is granted to members of this society, on the usual conditions (confession, Holy Communion, a visit to a church or public oratory, and prayer for the Holy Father's intention) on various feasts of Our Lord and of Our Lady,[28] as well as on those of St. Joseph, the Apostles, and certain other saints.

A similar connection is seen between devotion to Our Lady and the work for religious vocations in the Statutes and Norms for the Pontifical Work of Religious Vocations. In the Statutes the Pontifical work for Religious Vocations is placed under the protection of the Holy Family of Nazareth. The statutes strongly recommend abstinence and fasting on the vigils of Christmas and the Assumption.[29]

It is clear, therefore, that in its discipline as well as in its doctrine the Church is ever mindful of the place Our Lord has assigned to His Mother. She is truly the Queen in His kingdom. The law and the directives of His Church never lose sight of this paramount fact. They take cognizance of the fact that the recognition of Mary's place and dignity produces salutary effects upon His people.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[28] Pius XII, Motu proprio, Nov. 4, 1941, reported in *The Jurist*, II, 186. The feasts listed are: Immaculate Conception, Purification, Apparition (Feb. 11), Annunciation, Seven Dolors, Visitation, Our Lady of Mt. Carmel, Dedication of Our Lady of the Snows, Assumption, Nativity of Our Lady, Holy Name of Mary, Our Lady of Mercy (Sept. 24), Our Lady of the Rosary, Maternity (Oct. 11), Presentation.

[29] S.C.Rel., Statutes and Norms, Feb. 11, 1955, *AAS* 47 (1955), 298.

CRITICISM AND CENSORSHIP

Mr. Kerr's *Criticism and Censorship* is the development of a lecture given by the author at Trinity College, Washington, D. C., in 1954.[1] It deals with a topic that has been the subject of much discussion in recent years—censorship, particularly with reference to plays and films. Mr. Kerr is one who merits an attentive hearing when he speaks on this topic, for his studies and activities for many years have been devoted to the stage and cinema. For several years he was an associate professor in the justly famed Department of Speech and Drama at the Catholic University of America. He has successfully directed several dramatic productions, and at present is a highly respected drama critic on the staff of the New York *Herald-Tribune.*

In this book Mr. Kerr describes and deplores the conflict between the "critics" and the "censors," and essays to establish some harmony between them. He believes that, while some censorship is necessarily called for, there has been an unwarranted emphasis on the moral aspect of works of art on the part of Catholic critics—and he adds that too many are constituting themselves critics, without sufficient knowledge of art. He tells us:

> The average American Catholic is by now so indoctrinated in the censorial attitude that, on approaching a work of art, he never does ask: is it a good work of art or a bad work of art, will I like it or will I be disappointed in it? The first question he asks—and often the *only* question he asks—is: is it a decent or an indecent work.[2]

Mr. Kerr is of the opinion that this censorial attitude of Catholics is harmful to the development of a true artistic sense among them. He believes that "The generally low taste of the Catholic community in America has been a minor scandal for quite a time now."[3] He likewise states: "The Catholic community in this country, then, exhibits, not only a relatively low level of taste, but a confidence that that taste need not be improved."[4]

[1] Walter Kerr, *Criticism and Censorship* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1957), Pp. viii + 86. $2.75.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 54.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

He also makes the charge:

> The average Catholic reviewer employs a double standard in forming and articulating his judgments. He makes one decision about the artistic quality of the work at hand, and another—perfectly isolated—decision about its moral character. He thereby places himself in the position of holding that a work of art may be good aesthetically, but unsound morally. He announces, in short, that a work may be both beautiful and bad.[5]

Mr. Kerr's own suggestion is that we should try to pass judgment on an artistic production in its *integrity*—that is, on the principle that aesthetic perfection and moral excellence go hand and hand, so that one cannot exist without the other:

> It is deficient in integrity, and if integrity is a valid aesthetic requirement, it now becomes impossible to describe a work as aesthetically fine but morally corrupt. The question of moral corruptness—an ambiguous one, at best, since neither the heart of the author nor the response of the spectator can be perfectly known—does not even come up. The work is *aesthetically* defective, not a good work of art. The double standard disappears. A work cannot be "morally corrupt" (I am trying to use the phrase here as I think the Catholic reviewer uses it, to indicate a serious excrescence or a serious omission) and still be beautiful; conversely a work cannot be genuinely beautiful (possessed of integrity, wholeness, fidelity) and be "morally corrupt." A thing cannot be true and not true at one and the same time.[6]

I do not think that any intelligent reader can fail to benefit by some of Mr. Kerr's remarks, particularly his warning against the excessive use of censorship, whether official or private. Censorship is something that is odious in itself—and "odious things are to be restricted." Immoderate censorship involves objectively a violation of charity, by casting undeserved blame on the one who has produced a book or a play. Mr. Kerr relates a case of unwarranted censorship, when he tells of the good nun who, in the course of a college play, was alarmed at the incident of the steaming open of a letter by the villainess. The sister then and there resolved to undo the moral harm which (as she thought) might be inflicted on the

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 76.
[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 78 f.

pupils, and promised to instruct the girls on the immorality of the practice.[7]

If Mr. Kerr had confined himself to warning his readers against the unjustifiable and immoderate application of the laws of censorship to concrete cases, no exception could be taken to his remarks from intelligent and reasonable Catholics. Indeed, such a warning would only be the repetition of the admonition given by approved Catholic moralists.

But Mr. Kerr has not confined his condemnation to particular situations. He has gone much further, by casting doubt on the principles that form the basis of censorship under Catholic auspices or at least on the correctness of the Church's judgment regarding the general moral weakness of human nature. These points call for further clarification. To make the matter clearer and more definite, I shall confine my remarks to the stage and the cinema, and to those presentations that are concerned with matters of sex (not those that might be regarded as objectionable because of their treatment of suicide, brutality, etc.).

The Catholic Church believes in the lawfulness of censorship, and employs censorship to a considerable degree. In the matter of books the Church's official Code of Canon Law contains detailed legislation as to what Catholics may and may not read.[8] There are no explicit rulings in the Code imposing restrictions on plays or motion pictures, but the Popes have spoken on this point and the Bishops throughout the world, using their divinely granted authority, have also imposed censorship and instituted means of passing judgment on the moral aspect of plays and films, such as the Legion of Decency.

The basic principle on which the Church acts is the fundamental truth that sin is the worst evil that can come into the life of a human being. The Church also teaches that any voluntary sexual gratification (even though it is merely internal) outside of marriage is a grave sin. It is also a Catholic moral principle that (apart from a very grave reason) we must avoid the proximate occasions of sin—any person, place or thing that may strongly tempt us to violate the law of God, and to which we may succumb. Finally, to

[7] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 70.
[8] Cf. canons 1395-1405.

furnish people with proximate occasions of sin—for example, to produce or present motion pictures that will strongly urge many persons to illicit sex gratification (even if it is only in thought or desire)—is a grave sin, the sin of scandal. There are, of course, some abnormal individuals to whom even a perfectly proper scene or dialogue might be an inducement to sin, but the playwright or producer need not take these into consideration—otherwise, the theatre and the screen, perfectly lawful means of recreation in themselves, would have to be banned. This is actually what the Puritans did in England in the seventeenth century, as Mr. Kerr relates.[9] But this is not the Catholic attitude. However, it is the Church's attitude that we must take into consideration the effect that a picture will have on most or many persons who see it, and when it is foreseen that it will strongly urge a great number to the unlawful gratification of lust, it should be banned from the screen, or at least a warning should be given to those likely to be harmed ("B" pictures). Whatever artistry it may contain, however subtle and clever may be the plot, the injury it will do to souls makes it deserving of condemnation or disapproval, for all these features are unimportant compared to its detrimental effect on the salvation of human souls.

So much for the principles. Now for the actual facts. The portrayal on the screen or stage of something that is strongly stimulating to the sexual appetite, such as a woman who is entirely or almost entirely naked, will vehemently arouse the passions of many persons in the audience and lead many to illicit sex gratification, at least in thought and desire. The same is true of dialogue concerned with the details of sex activity. And, despite what Mr. Kerr asserts on p. 35, that we are uncertain about the results of any particular play or cinema, the Catholic Church, wise with the experience of nineteen centuries, knows full well that pictures and words such as I have described will be the proximate occasion of sin to many persons (and that many will sin). Hence, the Church tries to keep such pictures and words from the screen or the stage, or at least tries to keep Catholics from attending such performances.

These are the principles and facts on which the censorship of the Church is based. In our own land they are the guiding rules of the Legion of Decency. Anyone who admits these principles and facts

[9] Cf. Kerr, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

will realize that the Legion is passing very reasonable judgments. The pictures they ban or declare objectionable in part are such as do furnish a proximate occasion of sin to many persons.

Of course, if a person does not accept the Catholic doctrine as to the evil of sin, or does not look on sex gratification outside of marriage as sinful, or does not believe it wrong to present people with occasions of sin, he will naturally criticize the procedure of Catholic censorship. In the same category will be the person who believes that somehow or other the artistry a picture may contain will excuse features that are objectionable from the moral standpoint. Such a person is not aware of the value of the human soul, surpassing all other considerations.

It is difficult to see how a Catholic can doubt or deny the principles and general facts on which the Church bases its process of censorship. As to the principles, there is a statement in Mr. Kerr's book which leads one to wonder if he does admit all of them. He states—and apparently in a critical vein: "The *first* question (the average American Catholic) asks—and often the *only* question he asks—is: is it a decent or an indecent work?"[10] If Mr. Kerr believes this is the wrong attitude, at least when the average American Catholic is concerned with the practical question as to whether or not he may see a picture, then Mr. Kerr himself has a wrong attitude and does not perceive the full import of Catholic teaching on this point. For, since the most important feature of any work of art—and indeed, of any aspect of human life—is its bearing on eternal salvation, the first question of any good Catholic will be: is this a grave handicap to my eternal salvation? And if the answer is in the affirmative, he knows that he is bound to avoid this thing, if he can.

I believe, however, that Mr. Kerr's primary disagreement with the prevalent Catholic practice of censorship is concerned with the main fact mentioned above—namely, that pictures vividly portraying nudity and sexual activities do lead many persons into sin. He does not agree with the Church's interpretation of the reaction which will result on the part of many observers when sex is emphasized before their eyes. In regard to pictures portraying strong passion, he believes that the Aristotelian theory of "catharsis" is applicable. Since this point represents the very core of Mr. Kerr's

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

treatment of the subject, I shall quote his own words at some length:

> Aristotle was engaged, not in erecting some visionary standards toward a perfect play to be written in the future, but in reporting—and in attempting to identify—certain real experiences he had observed taking place in the theater. It apparently came to his attention that spectators, on rising from their benches after a successfully worked-out play (and especially after a successfully worked out tragedy) had a curious feeling of having been "cleansed." This feeling was an odd one, under the circumstances; why should a series of scenes in which characters act out of motives of lust, vengeance and demoniac pride end in apparent purification and relaxation of the spectators? . . . For the moment, let us talk about only the simplest and least sophisticated answer that might be given. . . . Whatever we feel in the theater—or in any of our other experiences of art—is a third-party feeling; the feeling itself may become passionate, but the passion is—short of insanity—always the passion of an onlooker. We do not actually take over, lock, stock and heavy breathing, the feelings of the party of the first part or the party of the second part . . . . Each character, each described passion, each exciting situation brings its own stimulus. The spectator's emotions churn, move, surge ahead to some point of maximum intensity. That point of maximum intensity is, of course, the climax of a play (in another form, it might be that thrilling moment when we finally see the object whole). But a climax is, almost by definition, the point at which gathering forces, gathering stimuli, gathering emotions meet—and fuse. Everything that has been rushing forward now comes into violent collision. In the act of collision these things coalesce into an intelligible unity. . . . A form of catharsis—perhaps a primitive one—has taken place. What the play has deliberately excited it has also deliberately discharged. Indeed the final and chief pleasure of art, as has often been said, consists in the overwhelming coming together of so many disparate elements in the establishment—or at least the unveiling—of an ultimate harmony. And the effect of this harmony upon us is peace, a profound sense of tranquillity, that familiar sensation of having been "cleansed." Art does not, in its nature, mean to send us away with a nagging burden of unfulfilled stimuli; its characteristic operation is one of fulfillment, of arriving at completion.[11]

The examples that Mr. Kerr cites in the course of this description of "catharsis"—from *Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet, Oedipus Rex,* etc.—are not quite pertinent to a play condemned by Catholic

[11] *Ibid.,* pp. 71-75.

standards on grounds of obscenity. However, since Mr. Kerr does not make any distinctions, we can infer that he applies the same explanation of "catharsis" as a justification for attending plays heavily charged with sexual passion.

If this inference is justifiable—that is, if Mr. Kerr really believes that the majority of those who go to see a picture that specializes in the vivid presentation of sexual passion go through the process of "catharsis" that he describes, Mr. Kerr is greatly mistaken. On this matter the Church is fully realistic. Those who govern and guide souls in the Church know full well that many (if not most) of those who see such pictures as are disapproved by the Legion of Decency because of obscenity are not interested in "catharsis" when they see nakedness and lasciviousness portrayed on the screen. They want the sexual gratification that will be produced by such spectacles. They are not aroused merely vicariously. They are personally absorbed in the enjoyment of sinful sexual pleasure.

This is the down-to-earth attitude of the Catholic Church when it approves and promotes such censuring agencies as the Legion of Decency. The members of the hierarchy, bearing a grave responsibility for the spiritual welfare of those committed to their care, are concerned particularly with the preservation of the young, so susceptible to sense impressions, from films that will lead many of them into sin. The Church's attitude in this matter is very different from that of most non-Catholics, whose ideas about sin—especially sexual sin—differ greatly from those taught by the Church. Mr. Kerr refers to this divergence of attitude when he says, "the Catholic seems to be the only man in the world who still believes that certain forms of censorship are defensible."[12] Even if this is true, it will not change the Catholic Church in its belief and practice in the matter of censorship. The Church is accustomed to being different.

I would agree with Mr. Kerr that a play, book, etc., should be judged in its integrity, and I believe that this norm is followed by most Catholic critics. It is true, a Catholic critic (of the type criticized by Mr. Kerr) may state that a morally objectionable product possesses some artistic excellence, but he cannot say that it is a true or beautiful work of art.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

In this general notion that a work should be judged in its integrity the intelligent Catholic critic and Mr. Kerr are in agreement. But, I believe, they differ widely in their application of this norm. Mr. Kerr stresses the aesthetic aspect as the primary object of judgment. From this one is likely to conclude that if a work possesses technical excellence, its moral features stand approved. This is surely the procedure of the secularist critic nowadays: and I wonder if Mr. Kerr is not in agreement with this method, since he tells us that "most good criticism now being written *is* secular criticism."[13] But the application by the Catholic critic of the norm of integrity is very different. He believes that the moral influence of a play or film is the most important aspect, and that if it constitutes a proximate occasion of sin for many persons, it cannot be excellent from the aesthetic standpoint, it cannot be a true work of art. As Pope Pius XI expresses it: "It is necessary to apply to the cinema a supreme rule which must direct and regulate even the highest art in order that it may not find itself in continual conflict with Christian morality, or even simply with human morality based upon natural law. The essential purpose of art, its *raison d'etre,* is to assist in the perfecting of the moral personality, which is man. For this purpose it must itself be moral."[14]

It is surprising that a Catholic, in discussing censorship, should not cite or quote the pronouncements of the hierarchy, the official teachers of the Catholic Church, and especially the statements of the Pope. Both Pope Pius XI and Pope Pius XII have made pronouncements on censorship with reference to motion pictures, which Mr. Kerr could have incorporated as representing the authentic ideas of the Church on this matter. (Some very pertinent statements of Pope Pius XII were made in 1955, after Mr. Kerr's speech, but well before its publication in developed form.)

Mr. Kerr observes that: "A few seasons ago a New York playgoer who took his Catholic magazine listings to heart would have felt free to see exactly one legitimate entertainment during the entire season. That entertainment was 'Howdy Mr. Ice of 1950.' "[15]

From this he concludes that there was excessive censorship on the part of Catholic authorities. But could it not be concluded, with

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] *Encyclical Letter on Motion Pictures to the Hierarchy of the United States* (June 29, 1936). NCWC translation, p. 2.

[15] Kerr, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

at least equal probability, that the theatre stood in need of a cleaning?

It is regrettable that a Catholic who is so well equipped by training and experience to discuss matters pertinent to the stage and the screen does not manifest a deeper understanding of the principles and facts on which the Catholic Church bases its doctrine and practice on censorship.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE BUFFALO PLAN FOR THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN

Although the physical and mental disorders produced in the growing child by the unhealthy social environments of twentieth-century America have been many and varied, none has attracted more public concern than the increasing incidence of juvenile delinquency among our youth. Citizen groups, the state and federal governments have organized investigating committees to look into the causes of the demoralization of our youth. Significantly enough, their investigations have revealed that very often the seeds of criminality and maladjustment are sown in early childhood, even in some cases in infancy. For this reason, authorities in the problems of youth have consistently insisted that the prevention of juvenile delinquency must be begun in the early stages of childhood.

Religious leaders have long insisted that any such preventative program must include the religious training of children from the earliest days of their childhood if it is to be successful. This is the period in the life of the child when physical and mental growth are the fastest and when attitudes and patterns of living are being formed. By giving the child a sense of his true worth as a child of God and of the moral responsibility that he owes to his God and his fellowman, religious training will help to develop within the child those character traits and patterns of living that have come to be associated with the well-adjusted individual.

This is not to suggest that the religious training of children is the cure-all for all personality and social maladjustments or that the lack of religious training in childhood is the only cause of such disorders. Scientific research has demonstrated that the causes of juvenile delinquency and other personality disorders are legion. It is suggested, however, that religious training, if properly given to children from early infancy, will do much to develop within them those attitudes and patterns of social behaviour that are so necessary for proper adjustment to adult life.

It must be remembered that children at birth are neither moral nor immoral. The fact that they possess that inner voice of conscience of which Saint Paul speaks in his Epistles must not be

misconstrued to mean that they can build up an acceptable code of morals without any outside assistance and moral guidance. The assimilation of sound moral concepts, like any other learning process, is gradual and continuous and necessitates the help and the guidance of parents, especially in the early stages of childhood.

Nor is it enough to teach children the necessity of moral behavior as a means of gaining social acceptance. If it is to accomplish lasting results, the moral training of children must be strengthened and supported by the development of personal ideals. This is the aim of religious training—to impress upon children that they must act in a moral manner, not only as members of society, but also as children of God with a supernatural destiny.[1]

In 1946, William A. Kelly wrote in the *Journal of Religious Instruction,* that "fundamentally, the task of the home is to train, guide, and direct the child in conformity with his nature and destiny."[2] This, of course, implies that the fundamental task of the home is to teach children their religious duties and moral responsibilities both to God and to their neighbors. It is difficult to measure with any degree of accuracy just how efficiently the home is fulfilling this function.

In 1926, *The Catholic Educational Review* published the findings of a study made by Sister Mary McGrath to determine the age at which a child first begins to distinguish between right and wrong. In testing the children in the sample, Sister Mary asked them to name "three things it is good to do" and "three things it is bad to do." Obviously, children at the ages of one and two could not answer the questions. Among the three-year-olds, one-half of the answers had to do with acts of obedience and disobedience.

The thing that seemed to impress Sister Mary most was that the children in the pre-school ages seemed to exhibit little or no religious consciousness in their answers. The children realized that they had to give obedience to their parents, but it was a purely natural act that had no relation to the truths of religion. Later evidence in this study demonstrated that this was due, not to the inability of the pre-school children to be religiously motivated, but

[1] Schneiders, *The Psychology of Adolescence* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1951), pp. 372 f.

[2] Kelly, "The Primary Determinant of Juvenile Delinquency," *Journal of Religious Instruction,* XVI (June, 1946), 907 f.

to the inadequacy of the religious training they had received at home.[3]

A more recent study of the religious training given to Catholic children at the pre-school level was made by the Rev. John L. Thomas, S.J., of St. Louis University, among children just entering the first grade of school. To determine what formal religious instruction and training parents give their pre-school children in the home, Father Thomas formulated a list of simple religious dogmas and prayers which pre-school children can learn rather easily if given some assistance by parents, and which, he assumed, Catholic parents traditionally teach their pre-school children. The lack of familiarity with these simple religious dogmas and prayers which the pre-school children in the survey evidenced forced Father Thomas to conclude: "The religious training of the pre-school child at home . . . falls far short of traditional expectations."[4]

Whether or not one wishes to agree with the conclusions of these studies, in recent years, there has been a growing tendency on the part of many parents in the United States to depend upon the school and the Church for the total education of their children. Because of the elaborate school system in the United States, both public and parochial, some of these parents are laboring under the erroneous belief that their duty toward their pre-school children lies in providing them with adequate food, clothing and shelter. This is particularly true of the religious education of pre-school children. Parents excuse themselves on the basis that their children cannot understand. What they fail to appreciate is that even though children cannot always understand, the words and deeds that they observe in the home "do leave impressions that should not be discounted."[5]

In commenting on this in *The Psychology of Character,* Rudolf Allers wrote:

[3] Sister Mary McGrath, "Some Research Findings in the Moral Development of the Pre-School Child," *The Catholic Educational Review,* XXIV (March, 1926), 145 f.

[4] Thomas, "Religious Training in the Roman Catholic Family," *The American Journal of Sociology,* LVII (Sept., 1951), 178 f.

[5] Endebrock, *The Parental Obligation to Care for the Religious Education of Children within the Home with Special Attention to the Training of the Pre-School Child* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1955), p. 78.

. . . It must be strongly emphasized that the very early years of life preceding the school age are the most decisive for a man's development, his behaviour in afterlife, and the moulding of his character. The study of both normal and abnormal psychology confirms this beyond a shadow of a doubt. On persons concerned with the upbringing of children during their first six years of life devolves the greatest—probably the entire—responsibility for their spiritual and moral development. School, later life, and the efforts of priests and physicians can do much by way of improvement; but the product that has to be improved comes from the hands of those who had the fashioning of it up to school age.[6]

It is not expected that children at the pre-school level will have anything more than a child's knowledge of religious prayers and truths. It is expected, however, that Catholic parents will instruct their pre-school children in these matters in accordance with their limited capacities. Unfortunately, many parents have neither the religious knowledge nor the pedagogical skills to give their pre-school children this kind of religious training. What is more disturbing, some are not even aware that religious training can be given in the pre-school years.

It would seem, then, that the clergy have a threefold responsibility to parents of pre-school children: (1) To remind them of their obligation to give religious training to their pre-school children; (2) To inform them that religious training can be given to pre-school children; (3) To guide parents of pre-school children who feel the need of assistance in the fulfillment of this important obligation. This, in effect, is the threefold purpose of the Buffalo plan.

THE ORIGIN OF THE BUFFALO PLAN

The Buffalo plan was conceived in the mind of the late Bishop of Buffalo, the Most Reverend John A. Duffy. As a priest in the Diocese of Newark, and as a Bishop in Syracuse, Bishop Duffy always displayed a great deal of interest in family education. One of his first acts as Bishop of Buffalo was to insist that each pastor organize parent-educator discussion clubs in his parish. Literature was provided for these discussion-groups and every effort was made to assist them to function effectively and efficiently. Unfortunately,

[6] Allers, *The Psychology of Character* (New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc., 1943), p. 136.

while this program met with great success among the better educated and well-to-do parishes, it failed miserably in the poorer parishes where parents were less educated and less inclined to join the discussion-groups.

Determined to help all of the young parents of his diocese regardless of their social status and educational background, Bishop Duffy sought to provide a more personalized type of parent education for his people. It was his idea that with a little training, experienced mothers who had successfully reared families of their own might be able to assist younger, less-experienced mothers in the religious training of their pre-school children. With this in mind, he asked his Assistant Chancellor (later Bishop), Leo R. Smith, to consider the idea, and, if possible, to formulate a program for putting it into effect.

Father Smith carefully selected seventeen experienced mothers of high repute in the Buffalo area to help in the organization of what was to be called later, the Bishop's Committee for Christian Home and Family. He met with this group of Catholic mothers for the first time in the library of the Sisters of Charity Hospital, in Buffalo, in the fall of 1939, and outlined the Bishop's idea for them.

For the next two months, this same group of Catholic mothers met with Father Smith frequently, planning the details of the organization and gathering together all of the written material that they could find on the religious education of the pre-school child. This material was bound together in mimeograph form and distributed among several members of a "pioneer committee" with the instruction that they were to evaluate it and break it down according to age-levels for use among mothers of babies ranging in age from three months up to and including the age of three.

In the discussions that followed the distribution of this material, much of it was discarded because it was not considered to be very practical or usable. The remainder, together with suggestions from the members of the "pioneer committee," based upon their own experiences as mothers, was compiled by Father Smith into a series of leaflets entitled, *Thoughts for Christian Mothers.* Later, this title was changed to *Thoughts for Christian Parents,* a title which included the father in the religious training of the child. These leaflets are still distributed by the members of the Bishop's Commit-

tee for Christian Home and Family to Catholic parents of pre-school children from three months to three years of age.

The techniques and the methods of instilling religious truths and values into the mind of the child, which the *Thoughts for Christian Parents* suggest, are based upon sound principles of child psychology and pedagogy. Each leaflet is adapted to the particular age-level of the child and suggests to its parents the virtues which they should exemplify in his presence and the type and content of religious teaching and practice which they should strive to give him at each successive level of development, from the age of three months up to and including the age of three.

The content of these leaflets does not ignore the limited abilities of the child to comprehend. On the contrary, it views the child as a growing, developing individual, composed of body and soul, both of which are interdependent upon each other for the healthy development of the child.

THE PROGRAM OF THE BISHOP'S COMMITTEE

The Bishop's Committee first began to function sometime during the Christmas season of 1939. As Bishop Duffy so often said, it was an experiment. For that reason, it was organized on a very small scale.

The members of the Bishop's Committee, all volunteer-workers, were divided into Hospital-Visitors and Home-Visitors, with one of them, Mrs. J. Edmund Kelly, as Chairman. The Hospital-Visitors confined their activities to Sisters' Hospital, in Buffalo, where they contacted young mothers during their confinement. Their function was to acquaint each young mother with the aims and purposes of the Bishop's Committee. In the beginning, this was done by word of mouth only. (Later, an introductory leaflet was prepared containing a personal message from the Bishop to the young mother. This introductory leaflet is now given to her by the Hospital-Visitor on this occasion.) If the mother expressed an interest in the services of the Bishop's Committee, which are given free of charge, her name and address were taken by the Hospital-Visitor and given to the Home-Visitor assigned to the particular area in which she lived in the Catholic Diocese of Buffalo. From this point forward, the responsibility for assisting the young mother in the religious education of her newly-born infant rested entirely with the Home-Visitor.

About six weeks after the mother and baby returned to their home, it was the duty of the Home-Visitor to make her introduction to the family. Later, a special religious medal was designed and mounted on an attractive card bearing the Episcopal Coat of Arms, in color, and inscribed with the words, "With blessings from Bishop Duffy." This medal is now given to the child on the occasion of the first visit which the Home-Visitor makes to the child as a special gift from the Bishop of the Diocese.

When the baby reached the age of three months, the Home-Visitor called again at the home of the mother and presented her with the first leaflet, *Thoughts for Christian Parents* of a baby three months old. When the baby was six months old, this visit was repeated and the mother was given the second leaflet in the series, *Thoughts for Christian Parents* of a baby six months old. This same procedure was repeated every three months for three years, placing at the mother's disposal the contents of each of the twelve leaflets prepared for each stage of the baby's development. When the baby finally reached the age of three, a blue booklet, entitled, *Religion in the Home,* was given to the mother. This was to assist her and her husband in giving the child religious training until he was ready for entrance into the Catholic school.

If the mother had any questions or needed any additional explanations of the material contained in the leaflets or any other assistance within the framework of the services offered by the Bishop's Committee, it was the duty of the Home-Visitor to provide them. At no time, however, was the Home-Visitor to interfere with the internal affairs of the families she serviced.

The work of the Bishop's Committee met with almost immediate success. During the first year of its existence, its membership increased from the original seventeen, working only in Sisters' Hospital, Buffalo, to fifty volunteer workers assigned to two hospitals, Sisters' Hospital and Mercy Hospital. Two hundred mothers were being serviced by the Bishop's Committee.

THE REORGANIZATION OF THE PLAN

The expansion of the work of the Bishop's Committee was so rapid that it soon became evident that it could not continue to function on a diocesan-wide basis. In spite of its increased membership, the home-visitations were becoming too time-consuming, espe-

cially with the curtailment of automobile travel during the gasoline-rationing period of World War II. In the summer of 1944, Mrs. Kelly, the Diocesan Chairman, petitioned Bishop Duffy for permission to reorganize the Bishop's Committee on a parish basis. The Bishop was quick to agree with this plan, but the reorganization of the program presented many difficulties. Every pastor in the diocese had to be convinced individually of the merits of the Bishop's Committee program. After that task was accomplished, a Parish Chairman had to be appointed, who together with the Pastor then had to select from the parish enough volunteer workers, of high repute, so that no one of them would have to be assigned to visit more than twenty families.

In spite of all these difficulties, the work of the Bishop's Committee has continued to prosper until today about 55,000 mothers are being serviced in 285 parishes in the Catholic Diocese of Buffalo, New York, by about 4,000 volunteer workers, with Hospital-Visitors serving in eighteen different hospitals.

The program of the Bishop's Committee for Christian Home and Family is unique in that it represents the first attempt in the Catholic parent education program in the United States to render personalized assistance to parents in the religious education of their pre-school children. So successful has this venture been that today the work of the Bishop's Committee is known and imitated in many of the Catholic Dioceses of the United States. Its fame has also spread abroad into practically every country of the world: Canada, Alaska, Hawaii, Central America, South America, the South Sea Islands, Japan, China, Australia, England, Eire, Scotland, Italy and Vatican City. Some of these countries have requested and are using the literature of the Bishop's Committee.

THE SUCCESS OF THE PROGRAM

It is difficult to measure with any degree of accuracy the success of a program such as the Bishop's Committee for Christian Home and Family. The growth of the program and the number of people it services are two indices, but they are not very accurate, especially when one considers that the services rendered are free of charge.

In 1954-55, a survey of the Bishop's Committee was made to determine just how successful it was in assisting young parents in

the religious training of their pre-school children.[7] Thirty parishes located throughout the Diocese of Buffalo were included in the sample: thirteen, in the City of Buffalo; eleven, in nine towns or cities outside of the City of Buffalo with a population of less than 100,000 people; and six, in towns with a population of less than 10,000 people. Five counties in western New York were represented. Every attempt was made to make the sampling as representative of the parishes of the diocese as possible.

Questionnaires were sent out to the Parish Chairmen, Report Secretaries, Home-Visitors and a sampling of parents receiving the services of the Bishop's Committee in these parishes. While the responses indicated that the Home-Visitors were not always as faithful and prompt as they might be in the distribution of the *Thoughts for Christian Parents* leaflets, generally the parents expressed a great deal of enthusiasm for the program and an appreciation for its need and assistance in the religious training of their pre-school children. Perhaps it might be of value to quote some of their comments here.

A mother may have good religious training and knowledge and yet not be able to convey it to her children. The leaflets do just that. Thank you.

To my mind, the services of the Bishop's Committee are invaluable; particularly to a "brand new mother." There are so many books, pamphlets and sundry literature on the subject of child care, made available through baby food companies, insurance companies, etc., all of which ignore completely the religious aspect of the baby's training. Generally, a new mother reads avidly and anxiously all she can lay her hands upon, on the subject of baby and his care, and is, I believe, particularly open-minded at that time to suggestions by those who know.

. . . I really appreciated the basic principles included—such as child training in habits of regularity; practice of good example and teaching love of baby Jesus. The pamphlets were a constant reminder of these principles. I am happy to say that my husband has read each pamphlet in its turn and has followed the advice given in them. His one complaint was the impracticability of the teaching plan to be set up at 6 months

---

[7] O'Leary, *"A Survey of the Bishop's Committee for Christian Home and Family in the Catholic Diocese of Buffalo, New York (1954-1955),"* Unpublished Doctoral Study, School of Education, University of Buffalo (June, 1956).

of age. The pamphlets served as a guide which we both believed in and therefore helped us to reach agreement on many points.

. . . Before I had my own child I often wondered how I would go about teaching him about God and you have made it easy for me. The pamphlets have really been helpful.

I would like to comment that while all my children are Catholics I am not of this faith so without these leaflets it would have been difficult for me to help them. My oldest child has made her first communion and the leaflets helped me guide her in preparation and understanding.

In general, the survey revealed that most of the parents make good use of the *Thoughts for Christian Parents* leaflets. 53.5 per cent of them replied that they find all of the leaflets helpful and practical; 27.5 per cent, a good many of them; 1.6 per cent, about half of them; 11.9 per cent, some of them; and 0.7 per cent, none of them.

It is an easy matter to express an appreciation of the leaflets and to state that they are used. To obtain more factual evidence of this, a list of fourteen items, summarizing the content of the leaflets, was prepared and the parents were asked to indicate the ones which they practiced in their homes. Eleven of the fourteen items were checked by at least 45 per cent of the parents as practices they use in their homes.

The Buffalo plan is not perfect. In addition to the delinquency found among some Home-Visitors in making their visitations, many mothers complained that the *Thoughts for Christian Parents* leaflets are too advanced for the age-levels to which they are directed. Nevertheless, even though the program did nothing more than to suggest to parents that religious training can and ought to be given to their pre-school children, it would be accomplishing a great deal.

The ultimate success of a program like the Bishop's Committee is not measured in terms of parent-opinion, but in the results that it is effecting in their children. For this reason, in the fall of 1954 and again in 1955, a rating scale was sent to the schools attached to the parishes surveyed to be administered to children entering the kindergarten. This rating scale was devised to test the children's attitudes (obedience, kindness, truthfulness, sharing, private ownership, and love of parents); familiarity with certain religious objects

(Rosary Beads, medals, statues and holy pictures, and the crucifix); knowledge of simple religious truths (the story of Christmas, the Holy Family, and the Crucifixion, and the presence of God in the church); and their ability to recite simple prayers (the Sign of the Cross, the Our Father, Hail Mary, Prayer to the Guardian Angel, and Grace at meals).

Unfortunately, there was some question about the reliability of the results obtained on this rating scale in the fall of 1954. The necessary pilot study that must be made in refining a rating scale delayed its introduction into the schools by two months. Since it was devised to test the religious attitudes and knowledge with which the children came to the school from their homes, the teachers who administered the rating scale had to depend on their memory to distinguish between what the children knew when they began school and what they had learned in school. Obviously, this made the results obtained on the rating scale questionable, except in the matter of attitudes. The attitudes of the children whose parents received the material of the Bishop's Committee were rated higher than the non-serviced children, surprisingly enough, even in the love they displayed for their parents.

To obtain more reliable results, the rating scale was administered again in the fall of 1955 during the first few days of school. Attitudes were not measured on this rating scale for the obvious reason that the teachers could not judge the attitudes of the children so early in the school year. In every item tested in this survey, the children serviced by the Bishop's Committee did better than the non-serviced children. Their over-all total score was significantly higher than the non-serviced children at the .05 level of significance which means that the possibility of this being a chance occurrence was one in twenty. It should be noted that the serviced children were not distinguished from the non-serviced children until after they were tested.

Realizing that it is extremely difficult to devise a test of this kind that will be unquestionably valid and reliable in every respect, the results of this part of the survey suggest, if nothing else, that when parents are reminded that religious training can and ought to be given to their pre-school children, and are given some assistance, they are apt to be more conscientious and successful in the fulfillment of this responsibility.

SOME OBSERVED RESULTS

It would be almost impossible to observe the results of the program of the Bishop's Committee for Christian Home and Family in individual homes. This would be an invasion of personal privacy. In 1952, however, the Bishop's Committee organized a discussion group program for parents who wanted something more than the material contained in the *Thoughts for Christian Parents* leaflets. Like the parent Committee, this is a highly organized program in which discussion leaders are trained by skilled personnel and conduct monthly meetings for the discussion of prepared agendas.

Working with these leaders, it becomes apparent how enthusiastic mothers are for any assistance that they can get in the religious training of their pre-school children. They realize the importance of this training and they are anxious to give it to their children.

It is interesting to observe also the wonderful effect that the program has upon the parents themselves. Concentrating on the religious training of their pre-school children, many of these parents find a new meaning to their marriage. Rather than seeing it as a state of life in which companionship and love are shared, they see it as God intended it to be, a union in which husband and wife mutually assist each other in the pursuit of their eternal salvation. More than one parent has commented that along with the religious benefits that this program has brought into their homes has come a closer spiritual unity between husband and wife.

CONCLUSION

The work of the Bishop's Committee is concerned with Christian education where it is most needed and effective, in the early stages of childhood. This is the period when the psychologists tell us that the growth of the child is the fastest, mentally and physically, and attitudes and habits of lasting significance are being formed. What is more frightening, some psychologists suggest that if a child does not learn certain tasks when he is ready for them during this period, he will never again be able to learn them to the degree that he could have then.[8] Among the tasks that psychologists assign to the period of early childhood are the "learning to distinguish right from wrong and the developing of a conscience."[9] Viewed in this light, the religious training of pre-school children is of paramount importance. For as William A. Kelly reminds us: "the individual's value

[8] Havighurst, *Developmental Tasks and Education* (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1951), p. 8. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

to society is his moral value,"[10] and his moral value is determined to a large extent by the moral and religious training that he receives in the pre-school years.

DANIEL F. O'LEARY, O.M.I.

Buffalo, N. Y.

[10] William A. Kelly, and M. R. Kelly, *Introductory Child Psychology* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1938), p. 281.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for July, 1907, entitled "The Pillar and Ground of the Truth," is contributed by Father H. C. Hughes, of England. The main theme of the article is that the best motive of credibility for the Catholic faith is the Church itself, "strong and vigorous and full of splendid energy, now as ever through the long centuries of her magnificent history.". . . Father T. Reilly, O.P., writing from Jerusalem, continues his series on "Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre." In this instalment he discusses the search for the holy places made by Constantine and his mother, St. Helena. Father Reilly favors the ancient tradition about the finding of the true Cross. . . . This issue contains an anonymous article entitled "American Bishops and Daily Communion." It discusses a recent decree of the Holy See calling for an annual eucharistic triduum in every parish, which would include the reception of Holy Communion by all the parishioners at the parochial Mass. The author points out the practical difficulties connected with this plan in a large American parish where the number of the parishioners far exceeds the capacity of the church, but adds that "as for the means to be taken to rally the faithful to a more frequent or even daily reception of Holy Communion at the parochial Mass . . . no better judges can be found than each bishop in his own diocese.". . . Father A. Keogh, S.J., of St. Beuno's College, Wales, writes on "The Social Position of the Early Christians in the Churches of the East," and concludes that the body of the faithful in the early centuries was composed of all classes of society, rich and poor, learned and unlearned. . . . The editor, Father Heuser, gives a lengthy review of *The History of the Society of Jesus in North America,* by Father T. Hughes, S.J., and praises it highly as "the first thorough application of the critical method in the field of our national religious historiography." . . . Father C. W. Currier in a letter complains that there are too many different societies soliciting donations for missionary activities, and suggests that one society be authorized to collect and to distribute all such funds.

F.J.C.

FATHER JAMES GILLIS, C.S.P.

On the morning of March 18, the significant strains of the *Requiem* rose through the vaulted arches of St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York and now and then, through the Mass, the distinctive voices of the Paulist choristers pleaded in subdued harmonies for the repose of the soul of Father James Martin Gillis, the intrepid soldier of Christ, and the crusader for truth. The calm music begging for eternal rest was in appropriate contrast at the end of a life marked from its youth by apostolic restlessness and consuming zeal. The obsequies, held in the Cathedral because the mother church of the Paulists was undergoing renovation, reminded all, as the preacher noted in his eulogy, that Father Gillis belonged to everyone. The presence of the Cardinal-Archbishop of New York and several other Bishops with the mourning family of the Paulist community testified eloquently that here in death lay a fearless defender of Catholic life to whom the official representatives of the faith were proud to pay tribute.

In a sense, Father Gillis was more than an historical character: he *made* history. The keenness of his perceptions, the resourcefulness of his mind, the zealous energy of his soul put a spirit into the life of Catholic Americans which could be attributed only to his unique and pervading personality. His apostolic zeal never diminished even after he had retired from the editorship of the *Catholic World*. It remained even after he had published his last book in 1956, after he was victim of a paralytic stroke, and after he celebrated his Golden Jubilee. When he knew his dissolution was at hand, he worked as if he were just beginning.

The life of Father Gillis has been told many times. There are few incidents in his career which he did not evaluate with a typically Pauline mentality. There was a day when he heard the words of Father Elliott in Brighton Seminary. The missionary spirit stirred him so thoroughly that day that he remembered the call as St. Paul might have remembered the Voice which reversed the course of his life as he hastened to Damascus. He saw in the Catholic missioner the most direct fulfillment of Christ's behest, and he thought of Father Elliott as the greatest man he had ever known. The right ideas had a stupendous power over the soul of

Father Gillis. The speculative had for him its relation to the practical as form has to the energy it is expected to produce. Speculation was for him thoroughly necessary, but irrelevant if detached from consequences. Not that he was incapable of accumulating speculative knowledge. At Boston Latin School and at St. Charles in Ellicott City, he made a brilliant classical course and went away with a degree *cum summa laude.* If he had a love for the classics and a keen taste for them, it was that he might use his knowledge for pointed and impressive comparisons while teaching Christian truth. Out of what was sheer speculative reasoning for most, he formed his plans and his principles. Like his patron, St. Paul, he would take all knowledge and all wisdom and make it serve the living God and he would use whatever he knew to conclude that he knew nothing save Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

So he followed Father Elliott back to the Paulists. After his studies in Washington he came to the Church of St. Paul the Apostle in New York on December 21, 1901 and was ordained a priest. He left the sanctuary that day in December ordained priest and missionary, consecrated irrevocably to the spreading and clearer understanding of Christ's gospel and doctrine.

The Licentiate in Sacred Theology which he received from the Catholic University in 1903 was not a routine achievement for Father Gillis. It made him a better-equipped missionary. His later years of administration and teaching at the Paulist College in Washington he saw with the single eye of a missionary to missioners. Once he began to work in the American mission field, all his pent-up energies came forth in an apostolate which can be calculated statistically only with the work of great missionaries in Catholic history: 325 weeks of preaching, 203 missions, of which 132 were for Catholics, 61 for non-Catholics and 10 for mixed congregations. He gave countless days of recollection for special groups, as well as retreats, spiritual exercises, occasional lectures and sermons. Many of these missionary expeditions were the difficult three- and four-week exercises in large city parishes of which preaching is only a part: in some places there were as many as nine thousand confessions in one mission. He felt a special attraction to the preaching of Temperance, which in some instances was so successful that he administered as many as four or five hundred pledges. You might see him high in the pulpit of some great cathe-

dral one day, and, not long after, standing at the altar rail of some impoverished little colored church in Alabama, or in a hall that served for a church in Arkansas. He preached to four thousand or he preached to forty, but he knew one thing, and that was Jesus Christ crucified. His work was to rally men to the foot of the Cross. He gave as many as three Lenten courses in one season. He preached with telling force on the necessity of Religion, the Divinity of Christ, the Catholic Church, Confession, Holy Eucharist, Marriage, Why I Am a Catholic. Nearly always he met with vibrant good will, but he loved to boast of the time the Paulists were shot at in some outlying mission.

With headquarters at the Paulist House on 59th Street from 1910, Father Gillis succeeded Msgr. John J. Burke, then fully occupied as secretary of the NCWC in Washington, to become editor of *The Catholic World* in 1922. Now we have, as it were, an additional Father Gillis. His missionary activity continued, he was here, he was there, he was in constant demand for rallies, lectures, and sermons; and yet, at the editorial office, a prodigious amount of writing issued from his desk. Month after month he produced editorials for the magazine which has so notably advanced the work of the Paulists, and it is safe to say that from 1922 to 1948 when he relinquished the editorship to Father Sheerin, there was not one fill-in editorial, not one pot-boiler. His incisive logic gave his style a power that was unique; his ability to develop a thought closely and with abundant instances made his meaning indubitably clear. Whoever opposed his views had no misapprehension about what his views were. When he decided to "lay somebody out" he did it with the precision of an embalmer. His appreciation of contrast either came from his wit or was the cause of his wit. If he had to summarize the opinions of the opposition he did so in complete detail; he wrote first as if he belonged to the opposition and then chose precisely the point of departure which made his contrast all the more striking. He loved fairness because he loved truth, hated hypocrisy and weasel words. He penetrated meanings and sensed dangerous tendencies; he prophesied at times with dreadful correctness. In the May, 1938, issue of *The Catholic World* his editorial ended thus:

> Put not your trust in princes is good advice to the people. Put not your trust in the people is good advice to princes. Remember, *Duce,*

remember *Fuehrer,* and remember Stalin, this is a cockeyed world. The people look at you now from one crazy angle; they need only to turn their heads to see you from another crazy angle. And if they do —!

Meantime, from 1928 until 1955 without interruption, Father Gillis wrote a weekly column for the syndicated Catholic newspapers. Who can estimate the enormous amount of reading and thinking represented by nearly a million words in those columns alone! It made no difference where he was, what he had to do, however wretched his health, the Catholic news-service had his *Sursum Corda.* Nor did his many engagements or the constant pressure of meeting editorial deadlines keep him from speaking regularly on WLWL, the Paulist radio station, from 1925 until it was discontinued in 1937; and from 1930 until 1941 he carried a series of talks each year on the Catholic Hour.

Despite this back-breaking schedule, books were being published starting with *False Prophets* in 1925. Men could go through life content to have contributed no more than one or two such books; Father Gillis wrote a dozen. Here are the rest: *The Catholic Church and the Home,* 1928; *The Ten Commandments,* 1931; *Christianity and the Prophets,* 1932; *The Paulists,* 1932; *This Our Day,* Vol. I, 1933; *If Not Christianity, What?* 1935; *Catholic Hour Addresses,* 1930-1941; *This Our Day,* Vol. II, 1949; *How Near Is God?* 1953; *On Almost Everything,* 1955; *This Mysterious Human Nature,* 1956; and nine pamphlets!

Many, many hours of Father Gillis' life were spent in reading. He wrote few articles in which there were not quotations from the most disparate sources. He was never behind in the latest news items or historical opinions. He never separated current political events from political trends of the past, no matter how far in the past. He was aware of the latest scientific theories and experiments, the tendencies in art and literature, the developing fads in psychology and religion, the geography and ethnology of the remote corners of the earth, the disputations of philosophers and theologians, the pronouncements of Councils and the Sovereign Pontiffs and he could call forth, almost at will, any section of the Sacred Scriptures. Year by year he learned more and more, and his cumulative memory relinquished nothing of what he had known fifty years before. He took in to give out, and his storehouse was never depleted; the assets were always double the liabilities. With

age he became not duller but keener, not more ancient but more modern, not more timorous but braver, not more hesitant but more crisply decisive.

As a preacher and lecturer he was irresistible. His manner was perfectly consonant with his thoughts. He could put new meanings into words by the way he pronounced them. His whole body strained with his message, calm or vigorous or limp or cautious. He could declaim in a high-pitched, strident voice or recite on a low, foreboding tone or whisper with perfect distinctness, he could change suddenly from an impassioned orator to a man who had some inconsequential remarks to make to an acquaintance on the street. He had perfect control: slowness, speed, emphasis, melody, mock dramatics, sarcasm, holiness, awe, disgust, joy, wistfulness—whatever the message required! His style as a speaker was utterly unique. Anyone who would try to copy him would make a freak of himself. But when he spoke, he used every elocutionary device at the right moment and with fascinating effect.

Had Father Gillis been inclined to worry about himself or take special precautions for his health he might have retired from duty anytime in his career. Though he had a robust constitution, he was never free, through practically his whole priestly life, from physical annoyances. From 1904 he was afflicted with a disease which turned his body into a mass of bleeding sores. Compelled at times to rest, he did so mostly under orders from his superiors. One time he preached a long mission in Chicago with a painful internal abscess which required constant care and medication. Arthritis set in ten or twelve years ago and a spinal weakness forced him to wear a brace. But even in his last illness he was gathering materials for another book. His body was slave to his mind and spirit.

Father Gillis had a superb combination of psychological and religious qualities which made him what Cicero required first of the orator: the *vir bonus*. Let him be convinced of a principle, and he had every virtue at hand to back it up: nobility, magnanimity, understanding, courage, vigor, idealism. He had a charity which was truly Christlike. It worked hand in hand with love of truth and fortitude. It knew where sympathy was to be placed and it knew whom it was destined to protect. His model was Christ the strong Son of God. He knew how to compassionate without condonation, how to comfort without weakening those he comforted,

how to understand and still not compromise. His charity was translated into energy for the greatest project of love: the salvation of souls. To that end he became a Paulist and therein you have the only possible explanation of his indomitable activity and zeal.

Father Gillis' humility had its source in his relations with God; he was so impressed by the majesty, the omnipotence, the omniscence of God that by inverse proportion his humility deepened as his realization of the perfections of God heightened. He had so sensitive an appreciation of justice and truth that they affected his whole life work and his personality. His love of temperance, particularly with reference to sobriety, has already been mentioned.

Father McSorley, lifetime friend of Father Gillis, held up this picture of his subject. His own native eloquence obscured none of the intimacy which it represented:

I have known Father Gillis longer and more intimately than any of his brethren; I have played ball with him; climbed mountains; sailed through storms; read poetry by evening in a little boat on a mountain lake. I have been his colleague on a faculty; I have argued with him—sometimes with more heat than either of us like to recall. He, himself, has declared I know him better than any man alive. I must bear witness to what I know. Even though I may displease him.

And here is my testimony.

On the natural level: To use a word that few persons would associate with Father Gillis, let me call him an *"old fashioned"* American, meaning that he is an embodiment of our country's best traditions.

Consistently a courageous champion of justice and truth, he answers every challenge to these ideals with "No surrender!" You might penalize him for this; but you could not possibly intimidate him.

He is one of those rare men who can "walk with kings, nor lose the common touch." I cannot imagine him fawning upon the powerful; or despising the poor; or oppressing the weak; or betraying a comrade.

He has always been—I almost said he has notoriously been—independent, original, bold; but again, I cannot imagine him ever disobedient.

And he has one characteristic which those who are not personally acquainted with him would hardly realize. This conspicuously gifted scholar, this spirited controversialist possesses a gracious, kindly, extravagantly tender human heart. That is why I venture to say that among his deepest feelings today is that of affectionate gratitude to

those two members of his family who are present, and to those others, no longer living, to whom he owes debts that can never be repaid.

His spirituality was eloquently described by Father McSorley and the theme carried out by one of his younger admirers, Father Vincent Holden, who preached his eulogy in St. Patrick's Cathedral:

> It is an interesting, but not surprising fact, that so much of his mind and thoughts were open for all to read and understand, but the deep and ardent spiritual life of his soul was a reality too sacred for scrutiny. Ostentation of any kind he deplored, but spiritual display he abominated. He would never for one second, even in his many conferences to nuns and priests, speak of, much less advertise, the time he spent before the Blessed Sacrament, nor reveal the extent of his personal love for Christ and his extraordinary devotion to the Holy Spirit. But though he never spoke of it, he could not hide its effects. He radiated a spirituality that was deep and profound, rooted in a generous and self-sacrificing love for Christ.
>
> A remark that his devoted sister passed speaks volumes for the beauty of that life. The last time she saw him offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was after he had been stricken last year and had received permission to celebrate seated at the altar. "All through the years," she said, "he has never changed. He says Mass now just as he did his first Mass." How many times priests look back with reverence on their first Mass and wish they could recapture the devotion, the recollection, the absorption they experienced in the Sacred Mysteries. That Father Gillis never lost, because his soul was constantly nourished with the grace that comes from a fervent, vivid and deep spirituality.

If you could characterize the spiritual life of Father Gillis by any one expression, you might use the word "discipline." There was discipline of mind, discipline put upon him by the requirements of faith, the discipline of steadiness, constancy and consistency, but above all, the discipline of the cross and self-abnegation. Again, nothing by halves: no speculation without practice. The inner life begot a calmness and affability in the midst of turmoil and contradiction. An exclusive preoccupation absorbed him: he was a priest, a priest sent to give testimony of the truth, a priest in many labors, like St. Paul; in journeyings often, in anxiety about the churches, often sleepless at night, but set to endure all things, to hope all things so that the gospel might be preached. You could think of Father Gillis only as a priest, not just when he was on duty,

or in his rectory or in the pulpit, but night and day for fifty-six years.

Praises poured in upon him when he celebrated his Golden Jubilee; the most eloquent were reprinted from *The Catholic World*. He left his copy "to the students at Washington, to be read with discretion!" On Dec. 16, 1951, Father Suarez, Master-General of the Dominicans, at the conclusion of the Jubilee Mass in the Church of St. Paul the Apostle, presented him with an honorary degree in Sacred Theology in the name of the *Angelicum* in Rome, the first time in history that such an honor was conferred on an American. Archbishop Cushing opened a Catholic Center in Boston in charge of the Paulist Fathers which will perpetually bear the name of the "Father Gillis Catholic Center." In his appeal for the completion of that Center, the Archbishop said he knew of no better way of perpetuating the unique contributions that Father Gillis has made to the Church of this country than to give the Center his name—the name, as he said, of one of the greatest priests the Archdiocese of Boston ever gave to the Church of God.

Numerically the Paulists form a small community and are of relatively recent origin. Few communities can count so many great men, and it is no strain on faith or hope or love to assume that on March 14, 1957, Father Isaac Hecker and his friends were on hand to welcome James Martin Gillis to their joyous company and lead him triumphantly, after having fought his fight and run his course, to the just Judge, who would put upon his noble head the crown of glory.

JOHN C. SELNER, S.S.

St. Mary's Seminary
Baltimore, Md.

TOYNBEE AND THE SOMERVELL ABRIDGMENTS

Ten years ago, in the spring of 1947, the writer accepted an invitation to dine with Professor Arnold Toynbee at Bryn Mawr, where the historian was giving the Mary Flexner Lectures. In his rooms at the college before lunch, Mr. Toynbee displayed with great interest a book which he had just received, a single-volume condensation of his monumental six-volume *A Study of History,* done by Mr. D. C. Somervell.[1]

Although the "pre-abridgment Toynbeeans," as they later came to be called, tended to look with a certain amount of disdain at this Lilliputian imitation of a Brobdingnagian achievement, Mr. Somervell's abridgment (which Mr. Toynbee considered an admirable summation of his thought) was destined to play a considerable role in the latter's consequent fame.[2]

In short, with considerable help from the Somervell abridgment, Arnold Toynbee was "discovered." During that same spring he lectured at Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Johns Hopkins, and gave talks in Montreal and Ottawa. To make these modest academic invitations seem dull by comparison, he was accorded the ultimate in contemporary American accolades, "cover stories" in *Time* and *Life.* And before one could say Abbasid Caliphate, the Somervell abridgment appeared in the best seller lists, whose previous preoccupation with things historical was largely limited to that bizarre literary form, the historical novel—in which very little is novel, and less is historical.

[1] *A Study of History.* By Arnold J. Toynbee. Abridgment of Volumes I-VI by D. C. Somervell. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1947. The original six volumes, published by the Oxford University Press, appeared over a period from 1934 to 1939.

[2] The writer, though a "pre-abridgment Toynbeean" who has carefully gone through the first six volumes, does not share this disdain. The faults of the abridgments are mainly the faults of Toynbee's original conception. Frank S. Meyer, however, writing in the *National Review* (April 20, 1957) calls the second abridgment "an unmitigated disaster" resulting from the fact that in the last four volumes, the "system" has choked Toynbee's insights. He adds: "Unless a fickle public has turned to Norman Vincent Peale, this second volume should bring Mr. Toynbee as much acclaim in the slicks and on the lecture platforms as did the first." *Ibid.,* p. 385.

The popularity with the masses of a supposedly esoteric theme, the interpretation of history, however unusual, was not unprecedented. Shortly before the end of the First World War, there appeared in the bookships of Austria and Germany an impressive volume, *Der Untergang des Abendlandes,* by a then unknown scholar named Oswald Spengler.[3] To a defeated and dispirited Empire the *Decline,* despite the controversy that it was to provoke among professional historians, became a popular and meaningful book, that was not only a palliative to the pain of military defeat, but an emollient reminder that victor as well as vanquished was included in the inevitable if gradual process of Western cultural decay.

The First Abridgment presented a digest of 617 pages of an original that contained more than 3,000. Although few of the "digest-minded" would find their way to Toynbee under any circumstances, they could find a twenty-five-page outline summary called "Argument" at the end of the abridgment itself. Neither Toynbee nor Somervell have ever considered the abridgments a substitution for the original work. Toynbee considers the works "complementary," and hopes rather wistfully that more intrepid souls will be led by the shorter works to "dip into the original, if not to read the whole of it."[4] He considers, moreover, the concluding summary in the second volume (which includes the "Argument" from the earlier abridgment) "the deftest piece of Mr. Somervell's work."[5]

Somervell himself, oddly enough, is rather apologetic about this portion of his work, considering it merely a table of contents, but

[3] Toynbee, though unable to accept the morphological determinism of Spengler, has a certain admiration for the German, with whom he is frequently compared. Cf. *Civilization on Trial,* New York: Oxford University Press, 1948, p. 9; *A Study of History,* I, 87, 135, 150; III, 221, and especially 383. The criticism of Spengler is found in the *First Abridgment,* p. 248, Toynbee's theory of civilization as a "product of wills" bears a greater resemblance to the *Kultur* of Spengler, for whom *Zivilisation* is a decadent or "sclerosed" culture. Cf. Jacques Maritain's "Religion and Culture" in *Essays in Order,* New York: Sheed and Ward, 1940, p. 4. Spengler emphasized that the *Untergang* of which he spoke was more like the gradual sinking of a ship, than a decline of catastrophic abruptness.

[4] *A Study of History.* By Arnold J. Toynbee. Abridgment of Volumes VII-X by D. C. Somervell. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1957, p. v.

[5] *Ibid.*

"too large and too ugly" to put at the beginning of his work.[6] In this respect, the modest Mr. Somervell has a point, for the fascination of Toynbee is more in the richness of his mind, the wealth of his imagery, and the startling juxtaposition of ideas, rather than in the complete originality or in the essential soundness of his interpretation of history.[7]

The original volumes also succeed where the abridgments do not in capturing the charm of a man deeply sensitive to the distress of his fellow beings, and implacably opposed to the racism, nationalism, and militarism which have so oppressed our generation.

Mr. Somervell's second volume completes the abridgment of Toynbee's work, and contains not only the summary of Volumes VII to X, but restates the entire "Argument" in a thirty-eight-page appendix.

The same procedure has been followed in both abridgments. Mr. Toynbee's wording is retained for the most part, but both Toynbee and Somervell have made some interpolations in the interest of continuity and amplification. Since Toynbee did not make his own abridgment as, for instance, did Frazer of *The Golden Bough,* one might ordinarily wonder how much of the thought of the abridgment would be that of the original author. Mr. Toynbee,

[6] *First Abridgment,* p. x. Many summaries of Professor Toynbee's thought have appeared that would make more profitable reading than a mere perusal of the "Argument." The finest this writer has encountered is Martin R. P. McGuire's "Toynbee's *A Study of History:* Fruitful Failure on the Grand Scale," in *The Catholic Historical Review,* XLII, 3 (October, 1956), 322-29. Dr. McGuire, who has something of Toynbee's extraordinary knowledge of source materials, includes an excellent bibliography at the end of his article.

[7] On the other hand, Mr. Somervell has a chastening effect in presenting more versions of some of Mr. Toynbee's less felicitous prose. The historian wrote, for example, in his original work: "On the one hand a circum-global maritime traffic-belt had now come to be sufficiently frequented to demand a global adjustment between the now contiguous extremities of a longitudinal series of regionally differentiated time zones that could not extend in a continuous chain round the entire circumference of the globe without there being a chronometrical discrepancy, of the time length of twenty-four hours, between the respective timings of the first and the last zones in the series at the line along which those two extremities now adjoined one another."

Charles Poore comments on this passage: "(This) means we finally had to have an International Date Line or there'd be chaos in time and hell to pay, if you ask me."

however, tells us that he has "carefully revised" the entire manuscript, although he has not made a line by line comparison with the original. He considers himself fortunate in having an abridgment "made by a clear mind that has not only mastered the contents but has entered into the writer's outlook and purpose."[8]

Although the partnership of both historians has been a pleasant one, the project of an abridgment was not originally intended as a joint enterprise in any sense. Mr. Somervell undertook the job solely as a hobby without any thought of its consequent publication, and graciously offered the manuscript to the original author for any use he cared to make of it.

As the task of abridgment was something Toynbee could not undertake because of the pressure of his wartime duties, Mr. Somervell's work was most opportune, and served as a fillip to the former to complete the later volumes.

Toynbee once referred to Spengler's work as one of "baffling immensity and enigmatic gloom." Although the former is not pessimistic in tone, there is in his own work a baffling immensity which has made even the most critical of reviewers understandably hesitant about entering the lists with a man who seems to be conversant with so much. But it must be admitted that the initial adulation of Toynbee's age of apotheosis—the late 1940's—has yielded a great deal to an age of opposition, in which the cautious and critical have been emboldened to take a closer look at Toynbee's thesis and to speak quite frankly of what they see.[9]

The Somervell abridgments undoubtedly have enabled many to see Toynbee in focus by stating his theme unadorned by almost bewilderingly diffuse excursions into the esoteric. But most of

[8] *Second Abridgment.* Preface i. In the preface to the First Abridgment, Mr. Toynbee says: "I have now made it fully my own by here and there recasting the language (with Mr. Somervell's good-natured acquiescence) as I have gone along . . ."

[9] Cf. *The Lie About the West.* By Douglas Jerrold, New York: Sheed and Ward, 1954; *Toynbee and History:* Critical Essays and Reviews. Edited by M. F. Ashley Montague. Boston: Extending Horizons, 1956. Toynbee's tendency to minimize the cultural contribution of Judaism is attacked in Maurice Samuel's *The Professor and the Fossil.* New York: Knopf, 1956. To the writer's knowledge, the Loyola Toynbee Symposium papers have not been published in their entirety. E. T. Gargan's article in *Mid-America,* 38 (1956), 67-83, gives an account of them. Professor Friedrich Engel-Janosi's contribution, the McAuley lecture on Toynbee, is to be published shortly.

Professor Toynbee's critics cannot, in their opposition to his conceptions, suppress their admiration for the grace and daring of his language. Pieter Geyl has expressed this double reaction to the historian in comparing Toynbee to an incredibly supple and audacious tightrope-walker who elicits admiration. He says: "One feels inclined to exclaim: 'C'est magnifique, mais ce n'est pas l'histoire.' "[10]

Professor Geyl has a rather whimsical criticism of the Toynbee "system" when applied to the world of reality, comparing it to Alice's croquet game in Wonderland.

> The mallet turns out to be a flamingo, which twists its long neck the moment we want to strike; the ball is a hedgehog, which unrolls itself and runs off; while for hoops there are doubled-up soldiers, who rise to their full height and get together for a chat just when you are aiming in their direction.[11]

One can hardly say that criticism of Toynbee's interpretation of history has been delayed until the final publication of the abridgments, or that his singularly obtuse critics, after ten years, have finally detected flaws in his thinking.

If Mr. Toynbee has encountered more criticism, it is because his writing has become increasingly vulnerable to criticism. This is precisely the difficulty that the second abridgment highlights—especially in the final "Argument." There is simply no single theme carried to its logical conclusion in ten volumes. *A Study of History* is rather a fascinating diary of the intellectual evolution of a man preoccupied with the mystery of history. But as Christopher Dawson has pointed out, what began as a relativistic phenomenology of equivalent cultures ends up as a unitary philosophy of history, in which the syncretic faith of the future, compounded of the four extant "higher religions" which have withstood the pragmatic test of time, supersedes civilization itself as history's most meaningful reality.[12]

[10] *The Pattern of the Past: Can We Determine It?* By Peter Geyl, Arnold J. Toynbee and Pitirim A. Sorokin, Boston: Beacon Press, 1949, p. 43.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

[12] Christopher Dawson, "Toynbee's Odyssey of the West" in *The Commonweal*, October 22, 1954, p. 62. It goes without saying that Toynbee's religious thought has altered considerably. The Savior so touchingly described (First Abridgment, pp. 530, 547) as unique among the savior gods

This development makes its final appearance in the last four volumes, and is treated in detail in Toynbee's most recent work, *An Historian's Approach to Religion.* The Toynbee of the 1940's was fascinated even then by the "higher religions" and the roles they had played in the history of civilizations; but the religious syncretism of the later Toynbee, an articulation of this theme, would seem to represent the "civilization with a capital 'C' idea" which in an earlier period he had lamented as "the egocentric illusion."[13]

To indicate the difference of approach in the historian's earlier and later work, a brief summary might be of some value.

Civilizations, it will be remembered, are first represented by Toynbee as intelligible units of study. Rather than the corporate results of master races, lush environments, or key individuals, they are rather the effects of creative responses to the challenges of environments, wars, economic vicissitudes, political and moral pressures. The life of a civilization is measured, not in terms of unvarying morphological pattern, but by the number of challenges it successfully meets, although Toynbee insists that one cannot establish a mathematical proportion between the intensity of challenge and the creativity of response. A wrong or inadequate response to challenge represents a "time of troubles," which represents a period of cultural atrophy. This "time of troubles" in the life cycle of a civilization may last for centuries (as exemplified by the life of Egypt's two empires), but it culminates in the eventual breakdown of the civilization, and in the establishment of a Universal State. The concept of the Universal State seems to be the connecting link between the earlier and later Toynbee.

It is to be noted that Universal States in general arise after, and not before, the breakdown of the civilizations to which they bring a species of social and political unity. They are conceived in negativeness (which is also the hallmark of their establishment and

---

is invoked with Christ Tammuz, Christ Adonis, Christ Osiris in his bizarre litany (X, 143). The man who once felt obliged to say in a footnote that he "has not become a Catholic" (I, 211) frankly admits that he would find it hard to choose between Christianity and Buddhism. Cf. *An Historian's Approach to Religion.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1956, pp. 131-146, 180-182: *A Study of History,* VII, 449, 735.

[13] Cf. *First Abridgment,* pp. 36-37.

maintenance), and are the products of dominant minorities which had formerly been creative. In the universal state, force is substituted for voluntary effort; social unrest and restless migrations are common. And the adoption by the "internal proletariat" (a minority *in* but not *of* the universal state) of a new religion is an eventual development.

To the earlier Toynbee the universal church seems to have been the seed bed of a new civilization; to the "new" Toynbee, the universal church, composed of Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, and Mahâyâna Buddhism, seems to be invested with historical ultimacy.[14] The fact that Toynbee's long odyssey has led him to religion (however heterodox) reminds one of a voyage described by Chesterton in *Orthodoxy* of a man who landed to plant the British flag on a barbaric temple that turned out to be the pavilion at Brighton. To anyone familiar with the writings of Christopher Dawson, the centrifugal cultural significance of religion is hardly a new theme among contemporary philosophers of history.[15]

Toynbee's personal theory of religion follows the logic of his essentially relativistic system. The four major faiths which he chooses as the means of effecting the spiritual unity of mankind are not selected merely because of their capacity to survive; but they are seen to survive precisely because they are devotional extrapolations of four basic psychic needs as conceived by Jung.

> Each of the living higher religions, and each of their principal sects, had been attuned to some particular type or sub-type; and each religion was ever seeking, like the psychological type which it served, to achieve the impossible feat of ministering to the whole gamut of the Psyche's elemental needs for expression.[16]

---

[14] Toynbee's choice of Mahâyâna rather than the doctrine of the original Hinâyâna form of Buddhism seems somewhat arbitrary. The doctrine of the Hinâyâna hardly constitutes an extinct religion, although considered an "Inferior Vehicle" by later Buddhism.

[15] "Every living culture must possess some spiritual dynamic, which provides the energy necessary for that sustained social effort which is civilization." Christopher Dawson, *Progress and Religion,* London: Sheed and Ward, 1937, Preface, viii. The relationship between religion and culture is the central theme of all of Dawson's work. Cf. *The Relation Between Religion and Culture According to Christopher Dawson.* By D. A. O'Connor, C.S.V. Montreal: Librairie St. Viateur. 1952.

[16] *A Study of History,* VII, 734.

Religious exclusivism, even if it be the authentic Church of Christ, is seen as a spiritual organ incapable of playing a psychic diapason. The heavenly music that is to satisfy all of the basic needs of the soul is to be heard in a symphony, not in a solo. Toynbee's religion of the future is to be found in a mundane ecumenical framework within which the heretofore rival higher religions will find that their forms of worship are ". . . so many alternative approaches to the One True God along avenues offering divers partial glimpses of an identical Beatific Vision."[17]

In the course of his exposition of religion, Toynbee manifests a disdain for any immutable body of divine Revelation, indicating that religion as an evolving human experience must adapt itself to the changing needs of the humanity it serves.

If this has a familiar ring to the Catholic theologian, the reason is not hard to find. Toynbee is not only aware of, but sympathetic to, Modernism, and quotes *Pascendi,* in a footnote, as indicative of the absolutizing of creed which he finds so reprehensible.[18]

There is, moreover, a latent anti-intellectualism in Toynbee's attitude to theology and philosophy in general. He makes a dichotomy between *fact,* which pertains to science and reason, and *doctrine,* which pertains to faith and the unconscious. Philosophies are merely cultural effluvia of their civilizations, and theology is inherently futile, as it represents but a *gauche* attempt to invest with academic respectability, what at best can be a verbal reconcilation between scientific truth and prophetic truth. Creeds as the products of theologies are, *a fortiori,* counterfeit ultimates.[19]

Toynbee, who surprisingly shows no awareness of the doctrine of analogy of being, accuses theologians of anthropomorphism in conceiving of God in terms of feeling, will, and intellect.[20]

From these general observations, it can be seen that Toynbee preserves a neatness of figure and systematization of imagery which is as aesthetically charming as it is academically suspect. In this respect his imagery resembles Hegel's triadic formula, and indeed, there is much in Toynbee's theory of an evolutionary spiral of religious progress that is Hegelian.

[17] *Ibid.,* VII, 555.
[18] *Ibid.,* VII, 456. No reference to Modernism is made in the abridgment.
[19] *Ibid.,* VII, 428, 474-475.
[20] *Ibid.,* VII, 467-468.

It is curious, however, that Toynbee can preserve the validity of his system only at the price of implicitly repudiating what seems to be one of his philosophic assumptions. He has a Heraclitean repugnance for the tendency to absolutize or to concretize that which he considers fundamentally dynamic; and yet his systematization, as in the case of his Jungian explanation of religious pluralism, is based upon the "form" which he imposes on reality.

One might suggest that the existentialists' protest against this formula type of systematization as a violation of reality is quite valid. Facts are not only supple, but they are numerous; and they can serve the tendentious creator of images as well as they can serve the more cautious seeker after truth.

The abridgments, although they omit many of the important details of Toynbee's theory of religion, nevertheless do illustrate the limited character of some of the historian's philosophic and theological conceptions. Without the gaily-colored panache of style and imagination, Toynbee's creation indeed can look at times quite undistinguished.

In fine, the "new" Toynbee and his thesis are hardly calculated to please most scholars. To those historians who believe like Collingwood that "eschatology is always an intrusive element in history," any appeal to a metahistorical principle is distasteful.[21] That is why Allan Nevins' tribute to Toynbee, in which he says the latter is "more than an historian . . . a great deal of a prophet," is hardly calculated to endear Toynbee to some of his more conservative colleagues. As they see it, prophecy in the historian is not a gift but a snare, a romantic divagation in which the dedicated historian can indulge only at his peril.

The theologian and the philosopher too are something less than enchanted by the bizarre eclecticism and breath-taking oversimplifications which characterize his religious and philosophic thought.

Toynbee, it would seem, has been ensnared by what Ortega y Gasset has called "ambrosial illusions." He is a man of great idealism, great charm, great sensitivity, and great wisdom; and it is not unlikely that there is a certain grandeur even in his mistakes.

There are two sentiments of Samuel Johnson which might illustrate the ambivalent feelings of a critic of Toynbee not gifted with

[21] Cf. Robert Paul Mohan's "Is There a Philosophy of History?" in *The New Scholasticism*, XXX, 4 (Oct., 1956).

the tremendous breadth of his vision. The first is rather severe: "Sir, it is not unreasonable for when people see a man absurd in what they understand, they may conclude the same of him in what they do not understand."

The kinder sentiment might be the observation of Johnson on women preachers, applied to writers of universal history: "Sir, a woman's preaching is like a dog's walking on his hind legs. It is not done well; but you are surprised to find it done at all!"

Toynbee has indeed undertaken a task that is not only hard to do well, but hard to do at all. If his success in the defense of human freedom and a personal God as the Lord of history is limited, one must remember that the opportunities for failure in such an enterprise are unlimited.

In the last and perhaps the most interesting of the volumes thus far written, Toynbee tells of seeing himself in a dream in which he saw himself clinging precariously to the foot of the crucifix over the high altar of the Benedictine Abbey of Ampleforth in Yorkshire. As he clung to the crucifix he heard a voice which said: "Amplexus expecta." It has been suggested that Toynbee's message to our time is to hang on and wait.

It is to be hoped that Mr. Toynbee will dream his dream again. May the voice which he hears be the voice of the Crucified, may the cross to which he clings be the cross of Christ, the one Christ, the Savior-God.

ROBERT PAUL MOHAN, S.S.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

THE ABSOLUTION OF A RECIDIVIST

Question: On what grounds do some theologians base their teaching that a recidivist may not be absolved unless he manifests extraordinary contrition? Is not the minimum degree of contrition sufficient for the fruitful reception of the sacrament of Penance, as long as it extends to all the penitent's mortal sins and is based on a supernatural motive?

Answer: The questioner is perfectly correct in asserting that no extraordinary degree of contrition is required from even the most hardened and most habituated sinner, including the recidivist, the person who has returned to the same habit of sin after previous confessions without any apparent effort at amendment. But the questioner is wrong in saying that some theologians require extraordinary contrition from the (formal) recidivist before absolution may be imparted. What these theologians demand is extraordinary *signs* of contrition. For, since the recidivist has proved that his mere assertion that he is sorry and intends to amend does not give the confessor sufficient moral certainty to justify the conferring of absolution, a more convincing proof of his dispositions is called for, and the signs by which this is manifested are called extraordinary signs by some theologians, special signs by others. Such signs would be the fact that the penitent is now making a mission or retreat, the fact that he has recently given up an occasion of sin, and above all the candid and sincere statement that he is now more aware than ever before of the necessity of amendment and is resolved to avoid sin in future *(verba cordialia)*. It is difficult to see how a priest can continue to absolve a person month after month when this penitent has been committing some grave sins regularly without any apparent manifestation of amendment, unless the confessor obtains more convincing proof of contrition than the mere repetition of the act of contrition.

THE CONTRACEPTIVE PILL

Question: A recent news item states that a drug has now been produced which will probably act as an effective contraceptive, the process consisting in this, that the drug, when taken on certain schedules, prevents ovulation. What is to be said of the use of this drug, from the moral standpoint?

Answer: The only account of this new drug that I have seen up to the present appears in *Time* for May 6, 1957. From the information provided by this article, the following conclusions seem to be justified:

First, since the drug apparently can either cause or prevent ovulation and menstruation, depending on the different schedules followed in its use, it would seem that if it is used to give a woman a normal cycle of twenty-eight days for ovulation and menstruation, its use is perfectly lawful. It is true, in a particular case the result of such treatment might be the reduction of the woman's fertility —namely, in the case of one whose cycle is providing fewer sterile days than is normal. If her menstrual cycle is properly regulated by this drug, it will mean that she will have more days on which (most likely) she cannot conceive. However, this would not be forbidden sterilization or contraception, since everyone has the right to use medical means that will help him or her to function normally. A similar case would occur if a woman had two wombs —a phenomenon that sometimes occurs. The excision of one would be *per se* a sterilizing operation, but it would be permissible, since it would simply produce a condition intended by nature.

Second, this drug might be used to relieve a woman who is suffering pain from menstruation or from bleeding, and it is possible that in providing a remedy for this condition the drug will retard or check ovulation, thus rendering conception impossible for the time being. But, this, too, would be lawful by the principle of the double effect, since the checking (presumably temporary) of ovulation would be only a byproduct of the procedure, permitted in view of the benefit which is directly intended. Even if the checking of ovulation were the necessary means to the cure, it would be allowed on the principle of totality. A practical rule for a conscientious doctor is this: When a married woman is suffering from a pathological condition, he may use the drug for her if he can honestly

say that he would consider it a necessary remedy for a woman who intends to practice continence permanently (for example, a widow not intending to marry again).

Third, if the drug is used directly as a contraceptive, a grave sin is committed against the law of God. For it is a serious transgression of God's law to interfere directly and positively with the process of human generation, whether it be done before, during, or after coition. The commentator in *Time,* after mentioning the possible use of this drug as a contraceptive, adds: "Since no ovum is then released, there is technically no destruction of life." This is perfectly true, but it does not justify the use of the drug for the direct purpose of frustrating conception. Catholic theology does not confuse contraception with the destruction of life, which would be abortion.

The article tells us that up to the present the efficacy of the drug as a contraceptive is uncertain. But, whatever may be said of the biological effects of its use, there is no doubt as to the sinfulness of employing it for the direct purpose of interfering with God's plan for the production of new life.

SOME PROBLEMS ON THE EUCHARISTIC FAST

Question 1: Must the three hours of fasting from solids and of one hour from liquids be computed strictly, or will it suffice (or at least constitute *parvitas materiae*) if a few minutes are lacking from the prescribed period of fasting now required before a priest celebrates Mass or a lay person receives Holy Communion?

Question 2: Will the passing from one time zone to another have any bearing on the eucharistic fast legislation now prevailing?

Question 3: When a priest binates and there is an interval of more than three hours between the Masses—for example, when one Mass is celebrated in the morning and the other in the evening —should he take wine as well as water at the ablutions of the first Mass?

Question 4: Does the rule still hold that Holy Communion may be given in the evening only in connection with Mass, or may the Holy Eucharist be administered even outside of Mass in the late

afternoon or evening to those who have observed the new fasting regulations of three hours' abstinence from solids and alcoholic beverages and one hour's abstinence from non-alcoholic beverages?

Question 5: According to the new regulations a Bishop is permitted to authorize afternoon or evening Masses only for the benefit of a notable part of the faithful. How many persons can be considered a notable part of the faithful?

Answer 1: The rule of "three hours from solids, one hour from liquids (except water, which does not break the eucharistic fast)" must be taken absolutely. There is no parvity of matter or "moral computation" in reckoning this period that must elapse between the taking of food or drink and the reception of Holy Communion or the beginning of Mass (in the case of the priest). The time must be measured exactly, up to the last second. This was the commonly accepted interpretation of theologians in respect to the concessions granted by the Constitution *Christus Dominus* in 1953, and undoubtedly this same interpretation must be applied to the recent legislation of Pope Pius XII in the Motu proprio *Sacram communionem.*

Answer 2: The passing from one time zone to another does not have any bearing on the new eucharistic fast legislation. For the obligation of the eucharistic fast is now reckoned according to the period of time that has passed since food or drink was taken, not according to the time that may be shown on the clock. Hence, depending on the route one may have taken, a person may receive Holy Communion (or begin the celebration of Mass) two hours or four hours after taking solid food—as far as the clock is concerned. Thus if a priest is travelling by plane from New York to Chicago, he could finish his breakfast according to New York time at eight o'clock and begin Mass in Chicago at ten o'clock, because actually three hours have elapsed. If he is travelling the other way, four hours must elapse (according to the clock) because actually this means only a period of three hours.

Answer 3: When a priest is to celebrate two Masses on the same day with an interval of three hours or more between the ablutions of the first Mass and the beginning of the second Mass, he may lawfully offer the second Mass even though he has taken wine for

the ablutions at the first Mass, since he has fulfilled the requirement of abstaining from alcoholic beverages for three hours before the beginning of Mass. From this standpoint, therefore, there is no objection to the use of wine for the ablutions at the first Mass. But the question arises whether, despite the change in the eucharistic fast ruling, the rubrical prescription stipulating that only water may be taken for the ablutions at the first Mass when a priest binates still holds. I do not believe that the prescriptions of *Christus Dominus* have been abrogated except to the extent that the new legislation modifies them. Now, the new legislation does not explicitly state that the fourth rule laid down in *Christus Dominus,* to the effect that a priest may use only water for the ablutions when he is to say another Mass that same day, has been modified, even when the other Mass is to be celebrated more than three hours later. Some might argue that in the case presented the reason for the rubrical prescription of *Christus Dominus* no longer exists, and hence the prescription itself should yield to the more general rubric that both wine and water should be taken for the ablutions. However, until a statement on this matter is issued by the Holy See, I prefer to regard the prescription of *Christus Dominus* that only water is to be used for the ablutions as still binding. However, if the second Mass is to begin three hours or more later, I would not hesitate to say that if the rubric still holds, the obligation is only *sub levi.* Furthermore, I believe that the concession of the Instruction issued by the Holy Office in conjunction with rule IV of *Christus Dominus* still holds—namely, that if a priest who has to celebrate another Mass inadvertently takes wine at the ablutions, he may nevertheless say this other Mass.

Answer 4: As was just stated, *Christus Dominus* still holds in those matters that have not been modified by the recent legislation. Now, according to *Christus Dominus* and the accompanying instruction, Holy Communion may be given in the evening only in conjunction with the Mass, celebrated by the permission of the local Ordinary—that is, either during, immediately before or immediately after the Mass. It would seem that this rule is still in existence. Hence, when Canon 867, § 4 states that Holy Communion may be given (even outside of Mass) only during the hours when Mass can be offered, it must be interpreted as meaning that outside of Mass the Blessed Sacrament may be administered only from one

hour before dawn to about 1:30 P.M. (Cf. Can. 821, § 1.) However, it should be noted that Canon 867, § 4 adds "unless a sound reason warrants the contrary," and by virtue of this clause I believe that Holy Communion might sometimes be given independently of a Mass in the evening to one who has fasted the requisite period of time. For example, if an evening Mass were scheduled and the priest assigned to it took sick, I would hold that Holy Communion could be administered to the faithful who had come for the Mass. But the mere fact that a person wishes to receive Holy Communion out of devotion would not furnish a sufficient exception, even though he had been unable to attend Mass in the course of the day.

Answer 5: In his comment on the recent Motu proprio *Sacram communionem* Cardinal Ottaviani states that the same number of persons could be regarded as "a notable part of the faithful" with respect to the justification of an evening Mass as with respect to a sufficient reason for bination, since this same phrase is used in the Code to designate the number that would miss Mass on a Sunday or holyday if the priest did not binate. (Can. 806, § 2.) Now, it can safely be stated that bination is permissible if otherwise twenty persons would miss Mass, and in some circumstances it would seem that a smaller number would justify the celebration of a second Mass. (Cf. Abbo-Hannan, *The Sacred Canons,* I, p. 799.) Hence, I believe an Ordinary would be fully justified in permitting an evening Mass for the spiritual benefit of at least twenty persons—and, on some occasions, of a smaller number. It should be noted that the spiritual benefit of a notable part of the faithful in respect to an evening Mass applies not merely to a Sunday or holyday of obligation, but to any day of the week, since this new concession authorizes Bishops to allow evening Masses on any day.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

HOLY COMMUNION DURING HOLY WEEK

Question: With the new regulations concerning the reception of Holy Communion was it permissible to distribute Holy Communion *causa devotionis* to the faithful on the last three days of Holy Week?

Answer: Even though new regulations and concessions were granted by the Holy Father concerning the reception of Holy Communion, it was not permitted to distribute Holy Communion to the faithful on Good Friday and Holy Saturday, *causa devotionis.* On Maundy Thursday we were permitted by the decree of Feb. 1, 1957, to bring Holy Communion to the sick either in the morning or in the afternoon.

EVENING MASSES

Question: Now that the new regulations permit evening Masses, how about nuptial and funeral Masses in the evening? Are they permitted in the late afternoon or evening?

Answer: The decree states that Ordinaries may permit late afternoon or evening Masses each day *"si bonum spirituale notabilis partis christifidelium id postulet."* Cardinal Ottaviani in commenting on this section of the decree asserts "that there is no longer any limitation on the days on which Bishops can allow Mass to be celebrated in the afternoon. The only condition is "the common good." Until there is further commentary on this decree and even after such a time, the permission to have additional afternoon and evening Masses remains with the Bishop Ordinaries. And so, too, the permission to allow afternoon nuptial and funeral Masses remains with the Bishop Ordinaries to be exercised at their discretion.

ROUND ALTAR

Question: A chapel is being designed for our new hospital. The building planned is round or oval and the architect feels this same theme must be carried out in the chapel and all its appointments. Is there any legislation about a round altar?

Answer: Father O'Connell *(Church Building and Furnishing)* states that "the present law of the Church allows great freedom in the choice of an altar provided its essential features are preserved.

. . . According to the present rubrics the table should be rectangular, not round or oval, because of the four anointings made at its corners—to weld indissolubly table and supports—at the consecration of the altar, and also, because the altar is to be clothed in its frontal."

GLOVES AT TIME OF HOLY COMMUNION

Question: Is there any ruling about women removing their gloves before receiving Holy Communion? It seems that the good Sisters have instructed some of the young ladies to remove their gloves before approaching the communion rail. This has occasioned quite a controversy among some of our "evening" theologians.

Answer: To our surprise we have found the following bit of information about "gloves" (Mahoney, *Questions and Answers,* Vol. II) : "As regards the laity, it is incorrect to approach the sacraments with gloved hands, not precisely because gloves are an ornament or vestment, but because social etiquette regards the ungloved hand as a mark of respect in the presence of a superior. The rule should, therefore, be observed, not only when receiving the sacraments, but on every occasion when the laity takes part in some divine service."

LEONINE PRAYERS

Question: A few years ago I recall reading that it was not proper to make the sign of the cross when one has finished the Leonine prayers after Mass. Some of the priests say that I am wrong. Who really is correct?

Answer: Most of the authors consulted state that immediately after the prayers have been recited the priest arises and goes to take the chalice from the altar. Some years ago this *Review* gave the following answer to the same inquiry: "The official text of the prayers to be recited after low Mass does not mention any sign of the cross at their conclusion. Therefore it is not of obligation. Yet the pious custom of the many priests who bless themselves should not be condemned."

GOSPEL BOWS

Question: When reading the gospel of the day's Mass does the celebrant turn to the tabernacle to bow whenever the name of Our Lord occurs?

Answer: When the name of Our Lord occurs during the reading of the gospel the celebrant bows his head slightly to the book. He bows to the tabernacle or crucifix at the reading of the epistle whenever the sacred name occurs. If the name of the Blessed Mother or the saint of the day occurs during the reading of the epistle the celebrant bows his head to the book.

ASSISTANT PRIEST AT JUBILEE MASS

Question: We are soon celebrating the pastor's golden jubilee Mass. At that Mass is it permitted to have an assistant priest?

Answer: Canon Law (#812) states "it is not lawful for any celebrating priest, except bishops and other prelates who have the use of pontificals, to have an assistant priest merely for the sake of honor or solemnity." The S.R.C. declared "that the practice of having an assistant priest in cope at the first Mass, when it was a High Mass, of a newly ordained priest 'might be tolerated.'" Books of ceremonies make no provision for an assistant priest at the jubilee Mass of a priest.

ROGATION DAY LITANY

Question: Is there a strict obligation for priests to recite the litany on the Rogation Days and the Feast of St. Mark?

Answer: "If one says his Office in English (e.g., the litany on Rogation Days) he does not fulfill his obligation. (S.R.C., June 3, 1904.) It is disputed whether or not the litany on the Feast of St. Mark and the Rogation Days obliges under grave sin." (*Moral Theology,* Jones.)

TWO PRIESTS DISTRIBUTING HOLY COMMUNION

Question: Do the rubrics forbid the celebrant of the Mass to "equalize" ciboria so that two priests can distribute Holy Communion at the same time? Is it permissible for the celebrant to transfer Sacred Particles from one ciborium to a second ciborium that has only a small number of Sacred Particles?

Answer: Prudence dictates what is to be done, it seems to this writer. The second priest assists the celebrant of the Mass at Communion time because of the great number of communicants. Why have him help if there are not sufficient particles? When such a situation arises the celebrant should equalize the ciboria before the actual distribution of Holy Communion.

COMMUNION TO A WELL PERSON ATTENDING THE SICK

Question: Sometimes when I bring Holy Communion to a sick person in my parish, the wife or mother attending the sick person requests permission to receive Holy Communion. May I grant this favor?

Answer: When a priest brings Holy Communion to a sick person, he is not allowed normally to give Communion at the same time to persons who are well and attending the sick patient. The respect due to the Blessed Sacrament and the liturgical prescriptions demand that Catholics who are in good health receive Holy Communion in church.

Duriex *(The Eucharist, Law and Practice)* states that "we believe certain special circumstances may justify an exception to this rule; with permission of the Ordinary, and on condition that all danger of scandal be avoided, we think that it would not be forbidden to give Communion to a pious person who is in the habit of receiving Holy Communion frequently and whom the care of the sick person prevents from going to the church. However, such cases are very rare."

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Analecta

In view of the mounting opposition of the Belgian Government towards the Catholic school system in the Belgian Congo His Holiness asked for special prayers during the month of April for the Congo's 17,596 Catholic schools. In spite of the fact that the Church has shouldered a major part of the task in educating some 1,245,000 students in the Congo, and in two adjacent U.N. Trust Territories—Ruanda and Urandi—the Belgian Government has been depriving the Catholic schools of their subsidies and constructing their own state schools where religion plays only a secondary role. So important does this matter seem to His Holiness that it has been made the April Mission Intention of the Apostleship of Prayer that the enormous amount of good accomplished in the past sixty years will not be destroyed.

Returning once again to an oft-repeated call to Catholic Action while addressing an audience of French students the Pope said that "the task of Catholic Action is more urgent and important than ever." Citing conditions present in Rome where the city's growing population is outpacing the building of churches His Holiness pointed out that Catholics should realize that in places where a priest cannot function the laity must in a way represent the Church. The judgment of Catholics, their attitudes and decisions cause the Church to be judged either favorably or to be compromised, he added. The Pope finished the address by saying that through participation in Catholic Action, the Catholic can "modify the mentality of his surroundings, exert an influence on habits of living and acting and obtain reform of institutions so that not only individuals but society itself may become what it should be according to the principles of social order and Christian morals."

On April 12 His Holiness granted a special audience to members of the International Committee of the Lamp of Brotherhood. The group represented five continents and included Prince Albert de Ligne of Belgium, President of the Committee. On the day previous to the audience the group attended the traditional ceremony at Monte Cassino Monastery of the offering of oil for the

Lamp of Brotherhood which is kept burning in memory of the dead of the fifteen nations who are buried at Monte Cassino.

In a letter written in the name of His Holiness by Msgr. Angelo Dell'Acqua Catholics were urged to enter the field of international relations to bring the light of charity where economic reasons and cold materialism have become the rule. The letter was addressed to Raoul Delgrange, president of the conference of Catholic International Organizations, currently meeting in Bruges, Belgium. The letter stressed that Catholic contribution to international life is important and effective and that all men must be told what Catholics who are working on the international plane are accomplishing. They should know what they themselves can do to support that action and what the Church expects of her sons in a world in which human relations are becoming more and more strained. In conclusion, the letter urged that Catholics who applied themselves to such matters would render "irreplaceable service and it would be to their credit that Christian thought and morals would be a ferment in this world's civilization."

Ever mindful of suffering throughout the world, His Holiness did not overlook the victims of floods in the Po River valley. The Pontifical Relief Organization sent supplies to those suffering the ravages of the flood.

Again on April 16, the Pope received in a private audience Masatoshi Matsushita, the special envoy of Japanese Premier Nobusuke Kishi. During the audience the Pope indicated that he would continue to exert his influence to combat evil uses of nuclear power. Although the Pope also gave Mr. Matsushita a written statement concerning nuclear weapons, the contents have not as yet been publicly released. Mr. Matsushita expressed his appreciation of the past statements of His Holiness concerning the control and use of nuclear power.

Taking as his theme the Paschal hymn, *"Haec dies quam fecit Dominus"* the Pope urged the world to remove the stone from the tomb in which it had buried the truth and goodness if it wished to enjoy in secure peace the prosperity promised by modern technology. Although the world is still living in a night of anguish, already a faint glimmer of dawn appears in the East, announcing the coming of the earth's resurrection to a day of glory and peace. To accomplish this, the Pope continued, "in individuals, Christ

must destroy the night of mortal sin with the dawn of grace regained. In families, the night of indifference and coolness must give way to the sun of love. In workshop, in cities, in nations, in lands of misunderstanding and hatred, the night must grow bright as the day; *'Nox sicut dies illuminabitur';* and strife will cease, and there will be peace."

Painting with vivid and eloquent words the thought of men before Christ's Resurrection the Pope said that he hopes "that another night—the night which had descended on the world and now presses on men—may soon see its dawn and be bathed in the rays of a new sun."

"Men of every nation and continent have been forced to live confused and anxious in a topsy-turvy world. . . . Error, common in well nigh countless forms, has made slaves of the intellects of men. . . . Individuals, classes and people persist in remaining divided and consequently without social intercourse. And when they do not know each other, they hate each other; they plot against, struggle with, and destroy one another."

But even this night shows clear signs of ending, His Holiness continued, and the discoveries of science, technical development, and organization are about to multiply methods for a fuller and freer development of life.

The Pope then ended his Easter message with the prayer:

Come Lord Jesus!

The human race has not the strength to move the stones which it has itself fashioned seeking to impede Thy return. Send Thy angel, O Lord, and make our night grow bright as the day.

How many hearts, O Lord, await Thee! How many souls are longing for the hastening of the day in which Thou alone wilt live and reign in their hearts.

Come Lord Jesus!

There are numerous signs that Thy return is not far off.

O Mary, who hast seen Him risen; Mary, from whom the first appearance of Jesus took away the unspeakable anguish produced by the night of the Passion; Mary, we offer the first fruits of this day to thee. To thee, spouse of the Divine Spirit, we offer our heart and our hope. Amen.

Even after so busy a day as Easter, Easter Monday brought no slacking of the Pope's activities. In the morning the Pope received

the leaders of the German Catholic Congress of 1956 who presented him with a documentary report of the proceedings of the congress held in Cologne. Also received in audience the same morning were Osvaldo Sainte-Marie, Chilean Minister of Foreign Affairs, and his wife. Later in the day a group of twenty-two American Marines, led by Gen. Randolph McCall Pate, the Marine Corps commandant, were received by the Pope.

In addressing a group of Parisian jurists on April 23rd, the Pope pointed out that "independence and disinterestedness constitute essential and particularly meritorious virtues in a lawyer." The Pope termed defense of individuals in court "a great art, composed of exactness and shrewdness, logic and eloquence, which must not neglect any detail." Again in noting the influence of lawyers on their times the Pope remarked: "It pleases us to note that in present society, so strongly compelled to seek technical specialization and scientific disciplines, you illustrate the irreplaceable value of classical humanism that underlines spiritual values and makes the meaning of man prevail over the cult of power."

Stating that talent alone was not enough in a profession so closely related to the exercise of justice, the Pope pointed out that professional ethics require a lawyer to serve truth alone. This burden becomes greater, he added, particularly when one must defend or obtain less severe penalties for a culprit. The Pope then concluded: "The greatness of an office manifests itself when justice and mercy embrace in a common love of God and one's fellow men."

On April 24 His Holiness made an appeal to scientific, economic, industrial and political organizations of the world to support a campaign for peaceful uses of nuclear energy. This appeal was expressed in a note from the Pope given to Masatohi Matsushita, special envoy of the Japanese Premier Nobusuke Kishi, who has been attempting to enlist support from various chiefs of state for a movement to abolish nuclear and atomic weapons.

The Pope's note told of human mastery over natural forces which are terrifying and which give rise to new motives for anxiety. Each opposing force tries to outdo the other in "the growing and unfortunately real terrors" which atomic weapons inspire. The Pope then said that "where natural catastrophes are concerned one can only bow before what happens by the Almighty's will. But should catastrophes occur through the perverse will of a man to dominate

—with all the retaliations which it would entail—how could such an act not be reproved and condemned by every upright soul?" The Holy Father then pointed out that the atomic arms race is a "useless waste of scientific activity, labor and materials" and that no one can foresee with certainty what the ultimate biological effects would ensure, especially hereditary, on human beings, to say nothing of the enormous immediate damage.

In a new encyclical entitled *Fidei Donum,* His Holiness issued an urgent appeal to the Catholic world to expand missionary effort, particularly in Africa. For the most part, the encyclical discussed the needs and problems of Africa, which "is opening up to the life of the modern world and passing through what may prove to be the most serious years" of its history.

After calling the attention of all bishops to their duty to maintain the missionary activities of the Church the Pope addressed to the bishops, and through them all Christians, an appeal for prayers, vocations and material help.

In a discourse of April 26th, addressed to members of the Italian National Convention of Hospital Sisters, the Pope stated that were it not for the dedicated work of the Sisters, the Church would probably have to give up many of its programs and many of its positions in the world. "The missionary work of the Church has been for a long time now almost inconceivable without participation of Sisters," His Holiness added. "But also in many regions where the sacred hierarchy is established, their (the Sisters) work is indispensable for proper organization of spiritual care." The Pope continued that it is necessary for such groups as the Hospital Sisters to check from time to time and examine whether their methods of life and action are still useful and effective. He warned the Sisters of the danger of drifting from the community life and counseled them to regard very carefully the spirit of poverty.

While speaking to members of the Pax Romana International movement on April 29 His Holiness requested them to work with unbelievers in peaceful efforts to achieve a united world. The Pope pointed out that the world can only be brought closer together if it is led "to the union of spirits and of hearts in a same faith and a same love." Toward the advent of a world community the Christian not only can but must work, the Pope added.

In answer to the question whether Catholic intellectuals, who adhere to a body of doctrine as given them by the Church, can collaborate in the service of the world community in institutions where God is not expressly recognized as author and legislator of the universe, the Pope distinguished between different levels of cooperation. His Holiness then said that there is a wide field of activity in which the Catholic can work in helping his associates, who have no faith, in their common pursuit of pure reason. "Minds free of prejudices and passions," the Pontiff continued, "can come to an agreement and help each other in behalf of a real and valid common good, for healthy reasoning suffices to establish bases of the rights of peoples, to recognize the inviolable character of the person, dignity of the family, and prerogatives and limits of public authority. This is why cooperation of Catholics is desirable in all institutions which, in theory and practice, respect natural law. They will seek to maintain institutions in the proper line of action and to play a helpful role through their presence."

Recognizing the objection of those who fear dominance of certain powers in such a world community, His Holiness said: "When it is a matter of defining the role which certain men are called upon to play in the formation of the world community, it is necessary first of all to recall the highest goal, the goal to which all others must be subordinated: For a Christian, the will of Christ is the ultimate reason of his choices and his decisions . . ."

More than 5,000 religious and lay catechists attending the French National Catechetical Congress in Paris listened to the reading of a letter sent in the name of His Holiness by Msgr. Dell'Acqua. The letter pointed out the function of the bishop as the director of all religious instruction in his diocese and also noted that modern education, with its emphasis on the technical and pragmatic, has almost destroyed what is called the sense of mystery of revelation so necessary in religious teaching. To offset this, the letter continued, there is a need for the study and development of new methods of approach to teach the young their Faith.

In receiving Prince Rainier and Princess Grace of Monaco at an audience on April 30, His Holiness said of them: "It is therefore Our ardent wish that one may always admire in you the splendor of Christian Faith, the harmonious balance between an irreproachable faithfulness to the exigencies of Catholic morals and

the respect of the duties imposed upon you by your rank, the convincing example of a happiness based strongly on peace of conscience, serenity of soul and the perfect union of spirits in charity."

Another distinguished Papal visitor on April 30 was Dag Hammarskjold, United Nations General Secretary, who conferred with His Holiness in an unusually long audience lasting forty-five minutes. Although not officially announced, it was widely reported in the Italian press that the main topic discussed was world peace, with special emphasis to the war threat in the Middle East and atomic disarmament.

Other Papal visitors included Loretta Young, American actress, and Hugh Gaitskell, British Labor Party leader.

His Holiness, in a discourse to members of the 11th congress of New International Organizations (Nouvelles Équipes Internationales), pointed out that international happenings of the past months have shown clearly that truth reveals itself at the expense of great suffering for men. Those who listened to the discourse, about 160 members of European Christian Democratic parties, recently convened in Arezzo, Italy, to discuss the political and doctrinal aspects of the recent communist crises from the time Nikita Krushchev denounced Stalinism to the recent Hungarian rebellion.

"There now appear," the Pope said, "in a light which leaves no room for doubt, the aberrations of a system which leads its followers to despise the fundamental laws of human nature which govern in an imprescriptable manner the behavior of individuals, families and societies." The Pope then urged the congress members to show clearly the effectiveness of the activity, "for you are in possession of a doctrine, an organization and live forces capable of solving today's major problems." His Holiness continued: "Instead of setting men against one another in a merciless struggle of inimical classes, you must seek to unite them for the service of the common welfare. Instead of deceiving them with false promises of unlimited security, you will lead them in the patient work of bettering themselves and the institutions of the entire society in which they live."

ROMAEUS W. O'BRIEN, O.CARM.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Book Reviews

GUIDANCE FOR RELIGIOUS. By Gerald Kelly, S.J. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1956. Pp. 316. $4.50.

In theological circles Fr. Gerald Kelly is the rightful owner of a well merited reputation for fine work. He has proven himself equally at home in the scientific area and in the field of popular presentation. The present volume stands witness. The vintage is not recent. "Almost all" the content was previously published in the *Review for Religious,* while some of it appeared in the author's *Good Confessor.*

The first three sections are intended as helps in the spiritual direction of religious and touch upon such practical topics as: emotional maturity, particular friendships, detraction, confession and communion. The fourth section presents material which is meant as an aid to religious who must counsel others. Included are chapters on vocational counselling, subjective sin, scruples and the race question. The division is arbitrary in that much of what is contained in the sections on the guidance *of* religious will be useful in what concerns guidance *by* religious and vice versa.

Fr. Kelly's treatment of maturity is good though not profound. It offers a wealth of material for productive particular examens. Frequently enough non-religious find the incidence of immaturity among religious surprising. In some instances the defect is brought bag and baggage from the "outside." But one wonders if the religious' training and *modus vivendi* are not somewhat at fault. Fr. Kelly merely alludes to this delicate problem when he remarks: ". . . The religious life of its very nature contains certain dangers to proper growth in maturity. It calls for much more dependence than is normally had in adult life; and if this feature is pressed too far it can readily change childlikeness into childishness" (p. 12). Here is an issue ripe for further study. Canon J. Leclercq has already pointed the way.

The chapters on fraternal charity are effectively done and complete in coverage. The lines of obligation and counsel are clearly drawn. Clerical religious will recognize here the matter covered in *De caritate.* Those who have not studied theology will find the exposition illuminating. In dealing with family spirit in the community, Father Kelly breaks a lance against those who have overemphasized the negative aspect of canon 530. To his mind the manifestation of one's conscience

to the superior is of considerable importance in fostering good superior-subject relations. In this he has the support of the rather revolutionary *General Statutes* appended to the recent *Sedes Sapientiae*. Of course, where lay superiors are involved reservations must be made.

In his presentation of diverse aspects of devotional confession the author strikes a note of eminent practicality. Ignorance can easily render this rich source of grace less fruitful than it should be. Perhaps the treatment leaves something to be desired. Focus on the positive values of reconfessing previously absolved sins, over and above the purpose of assuring a sufficiency of matter, could have been sharper. More important yet, some mention could have been made of the sacramental grace of Penance as a means to perfection. Again, the picture might have been rounded out with a brief exposé of the special efficacy of sacramental satisfaction.

Two of Father Kelly's observations merit special attention. The Sacred Congregation of Sacraments in 1938 issued a decree on frequent Holy Communion which, among other things, stated that there was to be "no rigid order in coming up (to communion), etc." Some inferred from this that communities ought to abandon any kind of order in approaching the altar. But Fr. Kelly does not "share the great enthusiasm of some writers" for dropping the order of precedence. His reasons: (1) many religious belong to small houses where abstention would be noticeable whatever order or lack thereof were observed, and (2) most religious are confirmed routinists. It would not be long before the demolished order gave way to a new one. His solution: the development of a proper attitude which allows everyone liberty of spirit.

After posing the question, "How often must one pray?", Fr. Kelly outlines the common teaching of moralists. He then proceeds to probe further. "Do all duties to pray add up to an obligation to pray daily?" Naturally, his answer is negative. But, he notes, some moralists would respond, "yes and no." *Theoretically,* they say, there is no obligation, but *practically* some *sin* is committed in the omission of daily prayers, because when "daily prayers are omitted without a sufficient reason it is often due to a small fault (sin) of laziness, sensuality or human respect." This opinion, though sponsored by "eminent theologians," leaves the Jesuit moralist confused. It grants that daily prayer is not obligatory, yet demands a reason for omitting them. Is this not a *petitio principii?* If there be no obligation, why demand a sufficient reason for the omission? To tag the sin as laziness, etc., is to obliterate the distinction between imperfection and venial sin. Laziness, etc., become sinful only when they cause the neglect of some duty binding under pain of sin. Hence the above formula cannot be recommended. Could not the same logic be applied *a pari* to the long-lived question about the

binding force of religious rules? The dictum that the rule does not bind *per se* under pain of sin, but practically each infringement entails a sin of slothfulness, etc., seems to posit the same specious reasoning as the formula of Fr. Kelly's "eminent theologians."

Finally, the chapter on the race problem is most apropos today. Nor is it out of place in a book of this nature. Would that it were more developed.

This small volume is to be highly recommended, especially to those who have little or no formal background in theology. An index serves to make the book much more useable than most of its type. While the author claims that his is not a "theoretical book," nevertheless he has culled the best theory of moralists and presented it in clear and practical fashion.

STEPHEN J. DUFFY, S.M.

PRIEST OF THE PLAGUE: HENRY MORSE, S.J. By Philip Caraman. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, Inc., 1957. Pp. xi+201. $3.75.

The gallows at Tyburn sets the scene for the beginning and the end of this biography by Father Caraman, S.J. England in the seventeenth century was a place of persecution for Catholics and more so for those priests laboring to spread the gospel of Christ among Catholics and heretics alike. Henry Morse was such a priest. His life is presented in a flashback from his execution. Born in the year 1595 and hanged in 1645, Henry Morse had an astonishing career. At the age of seventeen, while not yet a Catholic, he began the study of law at Cambridge University. It was there that the first doubts about religion assailed him, and thoughts of the Catholic faith entered his mind. Eventually he was baptized and received into the Church. Upon deciding to become a priest, Morse entered the English College at Rome and ultimately was ordained and later became a Jesuit.

Priest hunters, the pursuivants, abounded in England. There were many who earned their livelihood by discovering and betraying priests. It was into this environment that Henry Morse was sent. That he labored successfully in the midst of such hardship and cruelty is attested to by his fellow priests and the public records of the town of London. He was in prison twice and exiled twice for his activities and finally was hanged and quartered for the treason of being a priest.

The author states that he wanted to study "the life of what I might call an 'ordinary' priest in the seventeenth century." It is true that Henry Morse is an unknown name, but perhaps it may be said that in

those times in England no priest was "ordinary." The heroic courage of Henry Morse typifies the fortitude of all good priests in England during that trying age. He served as chaplain to the English troops in Europe during his exile and worked slavishly in relief of the poor and sick during the plague in London. These days are described in vivid and terrible detail in Father Caraman's biography.

The scene of Morse's last days present the most fascinating section of the book. Four days passed between his sentencing and his execution. During those days the prison at Newgate became like a market fair. An historian of the time records that: "Especially the day before he died, it was an amazing sight to watch the people; they came in their hundreds, from the first hour of the day to the last at night, to congratulate Christ's athlete on the victory at hand, and to beg his intercession for themselves and for their suffering country when he should enter heaven."

These days were spent in granting his blessing to the throngs who came to him; in patiently answering the questions of non-Catholics; in consoling his fellow prisoners; and in encouraging the priests who still had the battle to wage. His last Mass was said in Newgate prison, and it is typical of his life that this Mass was offered for his friends. His final words, spoken from the hangman's cart under the scaffold, sum up his immense charity and the willingness of his martyrdom: "I pray that my death may be some kind of atonement for the sins of this kingdom; and if I had as many lives as there are sands on the seashore, I should willingly lay them all down for this end, and to testify to the truth of the Catholic faith."

This book is both an inspiring biography and an important contribution to our knowledge of seventeenth century England. Father Caraman has well documented the book and presents an appendix containing the sources for each chapter. It is perhaps this emphasis on accuracy and the liberal quotations from original sources for the facts in the life of Henry Morse that may present a difficulty for the reader. The style and the interspersed quotations make for slowness in reading. After a few pages, however, interest in the story and increased familiarity with the author's style supply for the apparent defects.

There is no doubt that this is an interesting, even absorbing book which presents a little known aspect of the underground activities of priests in the England of the persecution. It is recommended not only as an intriguing sidelight of history but also as an inspiring tribute to the work and sacrifices of the "ordinary" priest during times of horror.

JOHN F. NEVINS

THE RELUCTANT ABBESS. By Margaret Trouncer. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1957. Pp. x+277. $3.75.

After writing her highly successful book on St. Margaret Mary Alacoque, Margaret Trouncer turns to another interesting and influential woman, Jacqueline-Marie-Angelique Arnauld, known usually as Mother Angelique, Abbess of Port Royal. Many people know of this abbey and its connection with Jansenism through the remark of the Archbishop of Paris, Hardouin de Péréfixe, who spoke of the nuns as "Pure as angels, but proud as devils."

This work is not admittedly a strict historical portrait of the unfortunate woman, but it does furnish a substantial picture of her character and of the times in which she lived. She became abbess at the age of eleven years through a document sent to Rome for approval which falsified her years. She was very strict with her subjects and, for the most part, with herself, but she was hardly the type of reformer that we see in St. Teresa of Avila or St. Colette with the Poor Clares. She was stern and rigorous, though kind too; but she had various eccentricities that made fertile ground for the false ideas of the Bishop Jansens and his followers. She never read his work, *Augustinus,* and she died two days before a letter of excommunication arrived from Rome.

Mother Angelique was a puzzling personality, not only to her contemporaries but to modern times as well. She lived near Paris, was acquainted with St. Francis de Sales, who perhaps died prematurely as far as giving her direction was concerned; but he might not have been able to hold her back from error under any circumstances. She knew St. Jane Frances de Chantal very well; she was a contemporary of St. Vincent de Paul. She had access to those who were holy and fully in line with Catholic teaching, but she preferred others who followed her own strange thinking.

Mother Angelique erred just as those whom she condemned for laxity. She clung to her own will, was proud, confused squalor with religious poverty, and foolish ideas on the spiritual life with genuine mortification.

This work is interesting and well done from a technical point of view. How much liberty is used with the true facts is another point. At any rate while Mother Angelique is to be rejected for her own false ideas and ideals she does evoke a certain sympathy. She was the victim of her parents' plans to make her an abbess, while so young and without a novitiate at all. And while the book has been done to relate a story, it gives a striking lesson as well—that humility and obedience are the two special ways of safeguarding the possession of the truth.

TITUS CRANNY, S.A.

THE BIBLE AND THE LITURGY. By Jean Danielou, S.J. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1956. Pp. viii+372. $5.25.

In this work Danielou discusses the biblical antecedents of our Christian Liturgy. With the aid of the Fathers, the author attempts to show how the rites of Holy Mother Church are the fulfillment of the figures of the Old Testament and how, in general, they are best understood against the background of Jewish modes of thought. In doing this, he also presents a veritable mine of Patristic commentaries on the Liturgy, of inestimable value to a full living of the primary and indispensable source of the true Christian spirit.

After an introduction in which he proposes his basic principle: Old Testament happenings are types of New Testament and Sacramental realities, and briefly examines his chief Patristic sources, Danielou, in twenty chapters, offers the reader a discussion of the various Scriptural types of the Sacraments of Initiation, the Eucharist and the highpoints of the Liturgical Year together with the explanations of them given by the Fathers. Of special excellence are the chapters dealing with Baptism, the Eucharist, Easter and Sunday.

While in some of his other works the author disavows the exaggerated allegorism of certain Church Fathers in their exegesis of Holy Scripture, in this book he does not always specify for the sake of the beginner just when his Patristic source is dealing with a genuine sense of Scripture and when it is making an out and out accommodation or developing an allegory. This does not at all militate against the high quality of the work, but greater precision in this respect would help to preclude any danger of misinterpreting Scripture. Furthermore, the scientific apparatus of the book leaves something to be desired. Both in the footnotes and bibliography we find several entries lacking in exactness and completeness. The author also uses many abbreviations which, for those not already acquainted with historical and Patristic studies, are not sufficiently clear.

This book should be heartily recommended to the priest in the pulpit who is desirous of offering his flock a deeper insight into the meaning and spirit of the liturgical rites and formulae. The professor of Dogma or Liturgy, who is in search of ways and means of adding more vitality, a greater feeling of Tradition and of giving a more pointed catechetical orientation to his courses, will rejoice over the help he will obtain from such a handy compilation of Scriptural and Patristic thought. Finally, the religious and the educated layman will find this book to be a genuinely enriching spiritual experience when used for spiritual reading and meditation.

JOHN H. MILLER, C.S.C.